The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXXXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, JULY 1, 1931 No. 3443

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 1
EDITORIALS:
President Hoover's Great Action 4
The Railroads at Bay 5
Latin American Policy 5
Sentences for Writers 6
GERMANY ON THE BRINK. By Alanson B. Houghton 7
PRESIDENT HOOVER'S RECORD. II. PRESIDENT HOOVER'S FOREIGN POLICY. By John B. Whitton 9
FREE SPEECH IN CHILDHOOD. By Bertrand Russell 12
YELLOW-DOG CONTRACTS FOR TEACHERS. By Henry R. Linville 13
IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 15
CORRESPONDENCE 15
BOOKS:
No Herb of Healing. By Leslie Nelson Jennings 17
The Itching Palm. By Paul Blanshard 17
Keynes on Money. By William E. Dunkman 17
Why Write Fiction? By Dorothy Van Doren 19
A Great Railway Builder. By William MacDonald 19
French Revolutionists. By Leo Gershoy 19
The Black Man's Burden. By Benjamin Stolberg 20
Books in Brief 22
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:
New Nationalism in the Philippines. By Andres V. Castillo 23
CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE 24

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, Editor
HENRY RAYMOND MUSSEY, Managing Editor
Associate Editors
DOROTHY VAN DOREN MAURITZ A. HALLGREN
Dramatic Editor JOSEPH WOOD KRUTCH
Literary Editor HENRY HAZLITT
Contributing Editors
HEYWOOD BROUN FREDA KIRCHWEY MARK VAN DOREN
LEWIS S. GANNETT H. L. MENCKEN CARL VAN DOREN
JOHN A. HOBSON NORMAN THOMAS ARTHUR WARNER
DAVID BOEHM, Advertising Manager

Subscription Rates: Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50; and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, No. 20 Vesey Street, New York City, Cable Address: Nation, New York. British Agent of Subscriptions and Advertising, Miss Gertrude M. Cross, 23 Brunswick Square, London, W. C. 1, England.

MINNEAPOLIS HAS ELECTED a Labor Mayor, William A. Anderson, who has been chairman of the Farmer-Labor State Central Committee and in former years was closely associated with A. C. Townley of Farmer-Labor fame. Denounced as a dangerous radical and personally much abused, Mr. Anderson defeated George E. Leach, who has served four times as Mayor of Minneapolis and became a brigadier general in the World War, carrying the election by the largest majority in the city's history, by about 28,000 votes. Mr. Anderson made no apologies for his affiliation with what the Minneapolis *Tribune* called "the most radical movement this section of the country has ever known," and he did not pretend that he had in the remotest degree changed his opinions. Indubitably the popular antagonism to the Hoover Administration counted, for it was a clear-cut struggle between the Republican and the Farmer-Labor candidates, but there was also a strong desire for a new political deal. Coming on top of the election of Floyd Olson as Farmer-Labor Governor, it affords ground for hope that here may be a beginning of the new third-party movement. At any rate Mr. Anderson's administration will bear watching by all liberals and progressives.

THE FRENCH CHAMBER OF DEPUTIES has set an example to parliaments everywhere by refusing to vote the 23,000-ton battleship which the Minister of Marine demanded as an offset to the new 10,000-ton German vessel. For once legislators have refused to be led by the nose by their government and the so-called naval experts. Would that our Congress might profit by the example! It was admirably pointed out in the debate that if France built a 23,000-ton battleship, Italy would build one of 35,000 tons, and that there would be no end to the thing; also it was insisted that it was preposterous to vote this ship when Europe is on the verge of a disarmament conference which will take place before the keel of the ship could be laid. This, and the tremendous popular acclaim given to Briand's pacifist speech at Gourdon, give us further reason to believe that the French people are not so frightened about their security as the politicians would have us believe. On the contrary, we still feel that if there is any real anxiety among the French people about their safety, it is because they have been whipped into it by their conscienceless politicians for the sake of politics and personal preferment.

DOMINION STATUS FOR INDIA with all the rights and privileges of other British dominions, including the right to secede from the empire, is the ultimate aim of the scheme of government which is reported to have been worked out tentatively by Lord Irwin and Mahatma Gandhi during their conference at Delhi. According to the London correspondent of the New York *Herald Tribune*, who claims to have received the information from reliable Indian sources, the viceroy will enjoy, during the transitional period before dominion status is attained, a measure of authority not greatly different from that which he has at present; but the limit of the transitional period is to be definitely fixed, and thereafter the viceroy, instead of being appointed independently by the Crown, will be designated on the recommendation of the premier of the Indian federal government and may be an Indian. The executive authority of the new government will be vested in a cabinet representing the princes and the majority party or party coalition in the two houses of the legislature. The legislature will be representative in each of its two branches of the Indian states and British India, the members from the states being partly elected and partly appointed, and minorities are to be insured representation if joint electoral action proves impracticable. The provincial governments are to be both responsible and autonomous. The financial arrangements, which include a reserve bank, appear to contemplate complete self-support for India, and the army will pass eventually under Indian control. These seem in the main most admirable and far-reaching proposals.

WHERE IS THE PROSPERITY Senator Jim Watson promised us a year ago, or the upswing in the stock market that Reed Smoot said was surely coming, or the return of confidence and certainty to the business world that Herbert Hoover looked upon as inevitable? These are some of the fruits which twelve months ago we were assured would come to us with the enactment of the Hawley-Smoot tariff law. Said Jim Watson to the Senate: "If this bill is passed, this nation will be on the upgrade financially, eco-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nomically, and commercially within thirty days, and within a year from this date we shall have regained the peak of prosperity." After the bill had passed, Senator Smoot declared that now "the stock market of course will recover." In announcing that he would sign the bill, Herbert Hoover said: "It is urgent that the uncertainties in the business world, which have been added to by the long-extended debate, should be ended. They can be ended only by completion of this bill." Mr. Hoover signed the bill on June 17 a year ago. Plenty of time has since elapsed to determine the truth of these prophecies. What about it, gentlemen; have the gods played you false, or were you merely talking nonsense to cover up what, as many intelligent persons knew then and as almost everybody knows now, was the most outrageous tariff robbery in American history?

THE INEVITABLE OVERTHROW of the bourbon protectionism embodied in the Smoot-Hawley measure, of which there are multiplying signs today, is likely to be brought about by the active agency of the great export industries, which find their ability to sell abroad lessened by the inability of foreigners to sell in our markets. James D. Mooney, vice-president of the General Motors Corporation, and Allan C. Reiley, former advertising manager of the Remington Typewriter Company, in their new book "Onward Industry" declare truly that "the old traditional policy has ceased to protect and has begun to destroy." As the authors state, self-reliant American industries are asking nothing except to be relieved of legislative policies that cripple their expansion. Could there be a better time than the present to strike out for lower tariffs, with the consequent stimulus to world trade and industry?

THE GRAVITY OF THE DEPRESSION in ocean trade can now well be measured by its effects upon the Atlantic steamship lines. The French Line, for example, with thirty-eight of its steamers laid up for lack of cargo and passengers, has had to turn to the French government for aid to the extent of no less than $12,000,000, in order to carry on longer and to complete the superliner which it is building for the New York route. The French Premier promptly responded by urging upon the Chamber of Deputies the granting of this entire amount in one form or another. Equally serious is the announcement that the United States Lines, which operate the Leviathan and ten other ships, are ready to abandon their project and may propose to the government to take back the ships, upon which they have already made substantial payments, with a view to reverting to their previous status of lessees of these vessels. Not in the memory of shipping men has it ever come to pass before at this time of year that some of the largest and most popular vessels have been withdrawn for a couple of voyages because of lack of traffic. Those that are continuing their sailings are, with the exception of the Europa and Bremen of the North German Lloyd, leaving with astonishingly small passenger lists.

SIR ARTHUR JAMES SALTER, former director of the economic section of the League of Nations, in his recent address before the Bond Club of New York gave an admirable example of the spirit in which important economic questions ought to be considered. He pointed out to the assembled financiers that the later development of our competitive, individualistic capitalist system has brought out with increasing clearness both its merits and its defects—the former consisting essentially in its stimulus to productive activity, the latter in its inability to utilize its capacity regularly and to distribute the results justly. If we are not to have chaos, then, we are faced with a choice, he declared, between collective leadership by industry and finance on the one hand and collective control by the state on the other. Hence he urged upon his audience the necessity for consultation in order that they might help furnish the leadership the world will need in their field, particularly in the way of checking mad speculation and undesirable government loans. Capitalism plainly cannot vindicate and maintain itself except by the exercise of collective responsibility on the part of its leaders, as Sir Arthur Salter suggests. Why can we in this country not have a larger measure of such thoughtful and reasoned consideration of the actual problems of our present position, with an attempt to find practicable solutions, instead of the passionate and unreasoning defense of things as they are that marks the utterances of our President and other public men of the same type?

SOMETHING APPEARS to have gone radically wrong in the Department of Commerce, the branch of the government toward which American business has long looked for reliable information on the economic situation. Dr. Ray Hall, one of the most dependable economists in the department, has resigned his post, according to a Washington dispatch, "rather than obey orders to juggle figures so as to show the nation-wide depression less appalling than it is." On the other hand, Dr. Hall's superiors contend that this was not the case at all. They deny that there was any attempt at juggling figures, and say, first, that Dr. Hall refused to submit to discipline in the handling of his work, and, second, that the resignation was due solely to a difference of opinion. The public has not yet been given the actual facts, so at the moment there is no way of judging the truth of the situation. But even granting that the explanation offered by Dr. Hall's superiors is substantially correct, one must wonder why it was found necessary to discipline him. This sounds suspiciously as though he had been given orders of a kind which he as a trained economist could not accept. In any event, the incident has thrown considerable doubt on the reliability of the department's business and economic information.

DEPRESSION IN REAL ESTATE has, of course, gone along with depression in business generally, and a recent report of the Real Estate Securities Committee of the Investment Bankers' Association may lead a good many investors to conclude that a collapse in realty bonds will have to occur before the country's business turns the corner. Of an estimated volume of $10,000,000,000 of real-estate bonds outstanding, the committee adjudges that $4,000,000,000 have "good standing" or are likely to "work out without foreclosure or loss," $2,500,000,000 may be expected to undergo foreclosure or work out with losses of from 10 to 25 per cent, $3,000,000,000 may suffer losses ranging from 25 to 26 per cent, and $500,000,000 represent unwise investments which may have to meet losses of from 60 to 100 per cent. Actually, the report is not so gloomy as it seems. To

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have 40 per cent of a ten-billion-dollar investment reckoned as sound or reasonably safe from loss, and another 15 per cent threatened with possible loss of only 10 to 25 per cent, seems a tolerably good showing for these troubled times. If stock-market prices are a fair indication of the present worth and future prospects of the industries which listed securities represent, the depression in real estate is no greater than the depression in industry and business in most other lines.

ONLY ONE of Mr. Hoover's Western speeches pleased his supporters and the party organs—his address to the Indiana editors. It had an unusual crispness, a drive, and a vigor which may be attributed to the fact that he has recently changed his literary secretary. It was, moreover, a partisan outburst marked by effrontery and stubborn adherence to the tariff and other party idols, so that it went well with the party hacks. The rest of his utterances pleased but little. His remarks about Lincoln were dull and banal. The speech at Harding's tomb contained a most damaging admission—that "Harding had a dim realization that he had been betrayed by a few men whom he trusted, by men whom he believed to be his friends." That is certainly damning. If President Harding had a "dim realization" only of his betrayal by Fall and others, why did he not obtain a clear realization? A few questions asked of newspapermen and others in Washington would have enlightened him fully. As Senator Walsh of Montana was quick to ask, why did not President Harding peremptorily dismiss these false friends at the very first intimation? And as for Mr. Hoover himself, why was this superman silent in the Cabinet? Why did not Mr. Hoover insist on Mr. Harding's doing something at once, or else do what every high-minded gentleman usually does under such circumstances—resign his own position and refuse to associate with crooks? We decline to accept the other alternative that so clever a man as Mr. Hoover was ignorant of the facts, especially after the speech of the senior Senator La Follette in which he thoroughly outlined the Teapot Dome scandals. And what is true of President Hoover in this connection is equally so of Charles E. Hughes, then Secretary of State.

WHEN MR. HOOVER or one of his appointees plays politics he is performing a "great service" for the country. When someone else sincerely tries to do the people a real service, his action forthwith becomes politics of an especially vicious sort. Thus reasoned Mr. Hoover in his Indianapolis speech. He said of the Wagner employment-exchange bill, which he vetoed: "I have refused to accept such schemes, as they would in many places endow political organizations with the gigantic patronage of workmen's jobs. That would bring about the most vicious tyranny ever set up in the United States. We have instead expanded our federal-government agencies, which are on a non-political basis. They are of far greater service to labor." It so happens, however, that a sober and responsible organization, the American Association for Labor Legislation, had troubled to look into the manner in which the federal agencies were being expanded under the careful guidance of Secretary of Labor Doak. It was found that at least fifteen of the newly appointed directors of the federal service were "members of the railroad unions with which Mr. Doak was closely connected for many years," and it was also learned that "several others who were given jobs in the 'reorganized service' are 'lame-duck' State office-holders whose fortunes were adversely affected by the political upheavals of recent State elections." The report quoted "one experienced State official" as saying: "It appears that Secretary Doak is persistent to set up his own political organization under the guise of an employment service." Rather amusing, then, is it not, to hear from Mr. Hoover that the federal service is on "a non-political basis"?

INDUSTRIAL WARFARE of the bitterest sort, with all that that means in the way of oppression and unrest, starvation and disease, today grips almost the whole of the soft-coal mining country. Using the only weapon at their command to fight the slashing of wages, which already were pitifully low, the miners have gone out on strike in many places. Bloody battles with company police and State militia have often followed. The strikers have not the financial means with which to carry on. They have not even enough money to keep their families from starvation and pestilence. Funds must be had at once to save thousands of families. A. J. Muste, head of Brookwood Labor College, has telegraphed from Charleston, West Virginia, the following appeal to *The Nation* for assistance:

> Am touring mine regions. Few thousand dollars in next ten days may make all difference here in West Virginia between union settlement and positive betterment or continuance of condition of harrowing starvation, disease, and heartless oppression in tense situation swiftly coming to head. Please rush aid here to Tom Tippet, Old Kanawha Valley Bank Building.

NEWS OF THE MISERABLE PLIGHT of our jobless millions reacts differently upon different people. It moves the President every other week or so to tell these hungry workers and their dependents that they must not look to their government for help. It turns our wealthy business men and bankers to brooding over the possibility of revolution and to making bewildering and misleading promises of prosperity about to revive. In Africa the news has inspired a small group of natives, themselves immersed in poverty, to offer out of their meager resources the sum of $3.77 to help the "starving in America," about whom they had been reading in their newspapers. "As actual money this sum is small," wrote Dr. Albert I. Good, missionary in Cameroon, Africa, to the Board of Foreign Missions of the Presbyterian church, "but as you well know the conditions out here and what such a sum of money means here, the gift is really large." This ought to melt a heart even of Hooverian hardness, but it probably won't. The day after it published this African contribution, the New York *Times,* through its Washington correspondent, described Mr. Hoover as being "in a very pleasant state of mind over the economic outlook." He was said to be particularly pleased with "a report covering the whole country which indicated that not a single bread line was now being maintained." So the situation is not nearly so bad as the facts available had led us, and the natives of Cameroon, to believe. Perhaps we had better suggest to the Board of Foreign Missions that it return the $3.77 to the donors, who were guileless enough to believe—like most Americans—that upwards of six million people in this country are unemployed.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Hoover's Great Action

WE believe that it is impossible to overestimate the world-wide importance of President Hoover's announcement on June 19 that he was conferring with the leaders of both political parties with a view to helping the world situation and especially Germany. Followed up the next day by his proposal for a year's postponement "of all payments on intergovernmental debts, reparations, and relief debts, both principal and interest, of course not including obligations of governments held by private parties," it probably constitutes the most far-reaching and the most praiseworthy step taken by any American President since the treaty of peace. In our issue of June 10 we declared that "no greater opportunity has ever come to an American President, save only Mr. Wilson, to lead the world and render it an incalculable service" than that which was facing Mr. Hoover, but which he seemed then to be entirely unwilling to grasp. Now he has grasped it, and the very first results have been what we prophesied they would be. "The mere announcement," we said in the same editorial, "that he had begun to busy himself with international affairs, with a view to cooperation and aid, would send a thrill of hope and encouragement all around the world." Two days after Mr. Hoover's move the New York *Times* was able to report that hearty approval of the President's proposal "was expressed in many parts of the world yesterday, ranging from Europe to South America and as far as China."

So the United States has gone back into European affairs. This time, not as in 1917 to make the European situation worse and to postpone for a year and a half the arrival of peace, but for the pacific and constructive purpose of taking the direct road toward the restoration of normal conditions abroad. Let it be admitted that it is but a beginning, a breathing spell, a palliative, a further putting off of the day when the whole reparations problem must be studied anew. None the less, it is of enormous importance because it is at last an expression of American willingness to lead; it is a concrete proposal for help, the vast psychological effects of which alone comparatively few Americans will be able either to gauge or to understand. More than that, it is the first time that Mr. Hoover has been willing to speak of reparations and debts in the same breath. Until now he has steadfastly maintained that they were entirely separate and not to be considered together. True, he has again restated his belief that "reparations is necessarily wholly a European problem with which we have no relation." But he has proposed in the same sentence the suspension of payments for reparations and debts and thereby admitted their correlation, their interdependence, his own inability to deal with one without the other. What will happen at the end of the year of suspension is anybody's guess. For the moment that is immaterial. We would not conceal our belief that the moratorium thus granted will be further continued; we have never from the beginning believed that the reparations would ever be paid, or the moneys owed to us either. This brave and admirable beginning of President Hoover should lead inevitably to a new conference to revise thoroughly the Young Plan and to fit it to existing conditions, or the conditions that may be existing a year hence. It never was a definitive settlement and it never could be.

That this proposal for a postponement of payments for twelve months does not go to the root of the difficulties which are undermining Europe and bringing more than one government to the verge of the abyss is perfectly obvious. The wicked treaty of peace with its impossible map of Europe, the tariff barriers, the fear and hatred of one country for another, the armaments which are leading directly to war as well as to bankruptcy—all these and other handicaps must be removed before Europe can be regarded as safe. But the point is that a great forward step has been taken in the uttermost good-will and in complete frankness. Through Mr. Hoover's action the United States again takes the moral leadership of the world. For once it is approaching the nations abroad in the true spirit of friendship and brotherliness, in that spirit of helpfulness and readiness to aid even at a personal sacrifice which we believe to be characteristic of the attitude of the American people in foreign affairs when their wishes and desires are not misconstrued and misrepresented by men in office in Washington. On the other side of the ocean it is a changed Europe with which we have to deal today just as a result of the few words penned by Mr. Hoover. There is not today a business man, a liberal reformer, a patriot, or a statesman anywhere who has not been heartened by what has happened over the week-end. Even if France should refuse to allow postponement of the payment of $100,000,000 for reconstruction, which is earmarked as non-postponable even in the Young Plan proviso as to a moratorium, the net result will still be a tremendous gain. Germany had expected to pay that right along. It should not have to do so for the next twelve months, but if it needs must it can undoubtedly do so. As for France, however, though the outcome is uncertain at this writing, we do not for a moment believe that it will dare to take a position contrary to that favored by every other country in Europe and by ourselves. But if her leaders should wish to play the dog in the manger, the sooner the better.

Perhaps the best thing about the Hoover action is that it came unexpectedly and of his own initiative, that he did not wait until absolutely compelled to move by the complete collapse of Germany or by a despairing round-robin from a group of European states. He was wise, too, in again coupling his action with the question of disarmament to the extent of asking that our move be considered a definite contribution to that spirit of international good-will which will alone make possible the success of the disarmament conference. Neither the government, Mr. Hoover, nor the American people will demand gratitude for their acts. But it would be the stupidest and most churlish ingratitude on the part of Europe, and especially on the part of the French, if the disarmament conference should not now be carried to a triumphant success. Time will show as to that. We would only repeat our belief that we may yet date the rescuing of the world from its present economic chaos from the day of Mr. Hoover's message. Both as Americans and as citizens of the world we express to him our unqualified gratitude.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Railroads at Bay

THE petition of the railroads for a 15 per cent blanket increase of freight rates is an impressive document. From the standpoint of the present law the request for an increase of revenues, and presumably of rates, is unanswerable, for the ability of the roads to provide the adequate and efficient service required by law is unquestionably threatened by the inadequacy of present and prospective earnings and the consequent probable financial difficulties. When the depression began, the executives, responding to the President's request, pursued a policy of maintaining normal expenditures "as long as it could be justified from the standpoint of the trust reposed by the railroad security-holders in the managements of the carriers, who were administering property which, though devoted to public use, is nevertheless private property"—a statement which suggests the root of the present difficulty. As the depression continued they undertook drastic economies, cutting maintenance expenditures far below the point of full maintenance. Even so, the return on railroad property reached only 3.54 per cent in 1930, and during the first four months of 1931 it was at the rate of but 2.24 per cent a year. The value of railroad securities has already been disastrously affected, and unless railroad finances can be improved, results of the gravest character threaten not only the roads themselves, but the savings banks, the life-insurance companies, and all the host of fiduciary and other institutions that have bought railroad securities because they were absolutely gilt-edged investments.

Further economies, the roads contend, are impossible except by slashing wages, a course of doubtful economic and political wisdom, and impossible, under the law, of prompt accomplishment. Hence relief, under that law, must come through added revenues. But passenger fares, at 3.6 cents per mile, are already at the upper limit, with the automobile cutting disastrously and permanently into passenger traffic. Therefore the roads ask the quick and direct relief of a 15 per cent increase of freight rates in order to save themselves and railroad investors from financial disaster. Even this increase, they contend, would bring a return of less than 4 per cent on their investment. As they are not allowed to earn high returns during times of prosperity, they cannot be expected to bear the full weight of adversity; otherwise investors will not put their money into railroads. The argument appears to us unanswerable from the standpoint of the existing law, yet we are entirely opposed to the proposed increase.

Under the law the commission must fix rates so as to yield, if possible, a "fair return" (fixed at the moderate figure of 5¾ per cent) on the value of property used in transportation. Accordingly, the roads are clearly entitled to the increase of rates requested, provided we assume that such rates will substantially increase revenues. Unfortunately, some of the executives themselves are doubtful whether a chief result may not be the further diversion of traffic to those deadly competitors, the motor trucks, and consequently little increase of railroad revenues. But assuming that no such result occurred, and that the railroads gained, might it not be economically disastrous, in a time of profound business depression, to lay on prostrate farmers, on manufacturers unable to sell goods for enough to cover the cost of production, or on the customers of both, the burden of a 15 per cent increase of freight rates? Such action would appear to us extremely unwise. The political results, not to speak of the economic consequences, might well prove fatal to our whole existing scheme of railroad control. For a decade railroad executives, necessarily pursuing the interests of their stockholders, have held up the processes of consolidation contemplated by law and required in the interest of economy and efficiency. As a result of the competition enjoined on them by law, they are today running numerous expensive and unnecessary passenger trains that are distinctly uneconomical. In the public view and in their own view, as illustrated by the above examples, their roads are private profit-making enterprises; yet they ask the public (and properly under the law) to tax itself at a time of severe business depression for the benefit of their investors and stockholders. The Transportation Act of 1920 worked fairly well under conditions of prosperity (though the roads received $2,579,000,000 less than a "fair return" between 1921 and 1930), and the railroads acquitted themselves handsomely. Depression brings out the fundamental logical contradiction of the act, with its attempt to assure "fair return" on private property.

What then? We hope to see an irresistible movement for government ownership of the roads brought about by railroad security-owners themselves in order to avert financial disaster. We should heartily welcome such a movement, for it would give to the American people and their government the first opportunity they have ever had for developing a transportation system without having at the same time to overcome the obstacles inherent in profit-making private ownership of railroads.

Latin American Policy

NORMAN H. DAVIS, Undersecretary of State during the last year of Woodrow Wilson's Presidency, does not like the recent policy of the United States toward Latin America, and in an article in the July issue of *Foreign Affairs* turns his critical searchlight upon some of its features. Recalling the expectation that Mr. Hoover's visit, between his election and inauguration, would not only "appeal to the sentiment of the people of South America" but also give the new President "an invaluable background for dealing with Latin American problems," Mr. Davis declares that "there is no outward evidence of any amelioration of the hostility toward the United States which had been rising during the last years of the Coolidge Administration," and that resentment against the restrictions put upon imports from certain Latin American countries has been "greatly intensified" by the Smoot-Hawley tariff.

The tariff aside, Mr. Davis finds fault particularly with the reversal of American policy, formally announced by Secretary Stimson in an address in this city on February 6, regarding the recognition of new Latin American governments. Briefly stated, the new policy is to recognize a new government "on purely technical grounds without regard to its legal status," whereas President Wilson and Secretary Hughes aimed at "fostering the growth of democratic institutions and orderly government" by insisting that a revolu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tionary government should receive constitutional indorsement by the people. Mr. Davis thinks it doubtful whether this disregard of "constitutional legitimacy" in the recognition of military dictatorships has furthered political stability in the countries concerned, and he even goes so far as to suggest that "though such a policy may not cause revolutions it tends to encourage rather than to discourage them."

The contention would carry more weight if Mr. Davis had not tried to support it by a defense of Wilson's course with the Huerta Government in Mexico in 1913. Mr. Davis credits Wilson with believing not only "that what the bulk of the Mexican people desired was democratic government," but also "that what the interests of this [the American] government demanded was stability in Mexico." It was an ill-assorted pair of dogmas, utilized in fact by Wilson to withhold recognition from Huerta on alleged moral grounds in the hope of getting eventually the kind of Mexican government he wanted. The Hoover-Stimson policy, of course, goes to the other extreme in extending recognition to a revolutionary government that is actually in power, but about the worst that can be said of it is that under it a revolutionary government may possibly be recognized too soon. There is always a chance of mistake in even the best-regulated diplomatic families.

Mr. Davis's apology for Wilson sticks out the more prominently because elsewhere in his article he comes out strongly against intervention. "None of the military interventions undertaken by the United States in the republics to the south," he declares flatly, "has resulted in any permanent benefit either to the people of the state in question or to the people of the United States themselves." If there be in Latin America at any time conditions which might in any case be held to justify intervention, they can be removed only by the people of those countries if the countries themselves are to remain independent. The United States cannot make people good by means of marines and warships.

Mr. Davis finds three main reasons for the "suspicion, fear, and latent hostility" which in general characterize Latin American feeling toward the United States. The first and most important is the tariff, with its gross discriminations in the treatment of Latin American trade. This difficulty, he thinks, might be met by giving to the Secretary of State a virtual veto on schedules which in his judgment "will prove fundamentally prejudicial to our Latin American relations"—an impossible proposal. The second is the misunderstanding and resentment which have resulted from our "insistence that the other American republics are not concerned in either the interpretation or the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine." He would overcome this by having the United States abandon its claim to being the "sole arbiter" and invite the Latin American states to proclaim the principles of the doctrine "as an integral part of their own national policy." The third is intervention. Mr. Davis concedes the possibility of situations in which intervention might be necessary, but he is clear that it should be exercised, whatever its form, "only in conjunction with, or after consultation with, the other American republics." Congress may be relied upon to prevent the application of Mr. Davis's tariff remedy, but his other two proposals contemplate an enlightened policy of international cooperation which the United States, as the most conspicuous offender, should lose no time in trying to bring about.

Sentences for Writers

WE do not mean sentences in the rhetorical sense, but sentences for guilt, real guilt, for offenses against readers and public, sentences bestowed in court without benefit of clergy. What punishments would fit the crimes of some of our writers is what has been engrossing us ever since the news came that the third and last trial held in the London School of Economics, for the benefit of King Edward's Hospital, was of the very considerable corpus of Mr. Gilbert K. Chesterton. The charge against him was quite to the point—"perversely preferring the past to the present"—and there were citations without end by the prosecuting barristers from the works of the offender to prove his guilt. But the criminal in the box was agile in his own defense. He swore, on his soul, honor, and conscience, that he had never praised the Victorians or the Victorian Age. He had only praised Gladstone because he was the most radical of the Victorians. Nor had he ever glorified Cromwell or the Puritans, or written mushily of "Good Queen Bess." He had even described the England of the fifteenth century as "corrupt, diseased, and completely decadent"—a useful alibi, weakened, however, by his admission that he "had praised a short time during the very best period of the Middle Ages." Nor had he been "one of the thousand modern idiots who clamor for the resurrection of the Greek spirit."

All his wily cleverness availed Mr. Chesterton not at all. The jury, which was the audience, pronounced him clearly and irrevocably guilty—they knew him of old. A severe sentence was pronounced at once, without any recommendation for mercy. Chesterton was doomed to read every word that Edgar Wallace writes, also every speech made by Lord Brentford, the champion of Victorianism. More than that, he was ordered to produce another volume on "Father Brown" within the next six months—all with no alternative of a fine.

We confess we have been thrilled by this event and its possibilities. What could not be accomplished toward the reform of our liter'y fellers if we had such a tribunal here! We should, of course, prefer to pick the jurors ourselves. But even so, we'd take our chances with an average American audience if we could fix the entrance fee for the trial at, let us say, five dollars. Offenders? Plenty. There is the leader of our humanists, Irving Babbitt himself. He, too, would persistently and perversely face the past. That he would be judged guilty we have no doubt whatever—without the jury's leaving the box. The sentence is at our finger-tips: that he read a chapter of his abhorred Rousseau every day and that he be put under $150,000 bond to read every line ever penned by his disciples—and may the Lord have mercy on his soul! As for our gentle, kindly William Lyon Phelps of Yale—against him the charge of humanism, or better humaneness, will also lie. His quality of mercy is not strained; on the contrary, unrestrained. What false hopes has he not raised in budding authors' breasts! His sentence? To read three novels a day in addition to the two he already devours and to read every eulogistic review that appears in the *Times* literary section. Two Draconian judgments? Aye, but well deserved!

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Germany on the Brink*

By ALANSON B. HOUGHTON

WE speak of the war as having ended a dozen years ago. So, in a sense, it did. But in a larger sense, as an underlying cause of much that has occurred since, the war did not end then nor is it ended now, for even today we are paying its bills in terms of a world-wide depression in business and a world-wide unemployment.

I happened to be in England when the war began. I shall never forget the consternation, the actual horror, with which the war was greeted. The peoples did not want war. They did not hate one another. They asked only to be permitted to go on living undisturbed. But those in political authority over them had chosen war in preference to peace. And under their leadership those great civilized peoples turned from the helpful and upbuilding processes of peace to devote themselves wholly to the processes of destruction.

Then came the armistice. The cannon ceased to roar. The Central Powers acknowledged defeat. And the warring peoples turned to the problems of the peace. At the moment the Allied Powers apparently had but one thought —that Germany must repay them. According to the theory on which they had waged the war, Germany had wantonly brought it on. The German people must pay for the evil they had done. And they thereupon proceeded to assess against that unhappy people sums which were fantastic. But hate, as it happens, is not a measure of capacity to pay. It is a fever of the mind. And gradually, as the war fever lessened and the ability to recognize facts returned, it became plain that if Germany was, in fact, so far as possible, to repay the sums the war had cost the Allied peoples, the amount must be determined in more normal ways. And first by means of the Dawes Plan and later by means of the Young Plan, a series of annual payments, which will end in the year 1988 and will cover both interest and principal of the sum finally assessed against Germany, was imposed upon her.

That, however, was only half the problem. The financial relations between the Allied Powers and between them and the United States had still to be determined. The principal creditor nations were France, which had owing it about two and one-half billion dollars, mainly uncollectible, Great Britain, which had owing it about eleven billion dollars, a large part of which was uncollectible, and the United States, which had owing it about twelve billion dollars, which for the most part was collectible. A bitter controversy instantly arose between the Allied Powers and the United States. Our government took the position that as we had paid our own bills and taxed ourselves to the quick to help those associated with us, the nations owing us should in all fairness repay, as far as they could, the amounts they had borrowed. Those nations, in turn, asserted passionately that we had no moral right to ask repayment. Finally, Britain issued the so-called Balfour note and declared that it would demand of its creditors only such amounts as would pay its debts to the United States. That put the issue definitely up to us. And our government then proceeded to make settlements with all the nations indebted to us. They were made professedly on the basis of capacity to pay. Speaking broadly, however, we neither sought to collect, nor did collect, the direct war debts at all. They were remitted. All we asked our friends to pay was what they had borrowed for other purposes indirectly related. It seems to me, I confess, that the settlement made was not ungenerous. In the arrangements subsequently worked out, Britain, France, and the others, by making the sums owing us a part of the German reparation payments, simply transferred to Germany the whole burden of their indebtedness to us, and inferentially at least, as I said, made their payments to us conditional upon Germany's payment to them. Naturally, to these arrangements our government has not agreed. It still maintains that those who borrowed from us, and not a third party, are responsible to us for payment. So far, no difficulty has arisen. Germany has made the necessary payments to her creditors. The United States has been paid by them in turn. And there, at the moment, the matter rests. Whether, in case of German default, the Allied Powers either would pay us, or could pay us, we do not know. The final responsibility has not been fixed.

Thus matters stood for some years. Then came the collapse. First in one country, then in another, business began to slacken. Unemployment began to assume formidable proportions. Even here in America we found ourselves caught in the same current. Naturally we asked ourselves the reasons for so tremendous a change. Many good people fear that we have demanded more of our debtors, already weakened by the war, than they could safely pay, and that they have broken down under the strain of our demands, and that, as a consequence, we are now all floundering in an economic slough of despond. These people point out that the depression is costing us untold sums annually and that what we are recovering by way of payments on the war debts is negligible by comparison. In grasping for the shadow, we have lost the substance. Our true course, they think, is plain.

Now, whatever else may be said regarding this argument, it must be obvious to you that it rests upon a misunderstanding of the facts. The Allied peoples are not groaning under the burden of what they owe us. They pay us nothing. They act merely as transfer agents, and pay us out of the reparation payments they have forced Germany to pay them. The burden of our war debts rests directly upon the German people. But if this were not so, are the annual payments made us of such size and importance as to justify us in believing their remission would contribute materially to world recovery? I would confess I doubt it. With the broad assumption that we shall prosper most by making trade with us easy rather than difficult, I find myself in cordial sympathy. I am sure that the time has passed when we can think of America in terms of comparative isolation. But the argument on this point relates, it seems to me, primarily, not to reparation payments, but to tariffs,

* An address delivered on June 9, 1931, at the Carnegie Institute of Technology. Mr. Houghton is not responsible for the condensation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and with tariffs and their effect on trade and industry I have this morning, fortunately, nothing to do.

What we are interested in at the moment is to discover whether the remission of our war debts will materially aid in the restoration of normal conditions of economic life throughout the world. If we think of the situation in terms of international trade, the two hundred million odd dollars now paid us annually, which is perhaps 1 per cent of that trade, seems a wholly disproportionate amount to affect it seriously either way. The annual budgets of the nations with which we were associated during the war amounts, roughly, if we take for comparison the year 1930, to something like twelve thousand millions of dollars per year. In other words, the payments made us represent about 1½ per cent of their annual budget expenditures. Under such conditions surely it is mere exaggeration to assert that these payments constitute an unbearable burden.

All this touches only indirectly and very slightly what I conceive to be the real problem involved in the war debts. And that is whether Germany, because of reasons beyond her control, is now so situated that she is unable to emerge from her present economic and financial difficulties without help. And that is a very serious problem indeed.

All the great industrial nations are suffering from the prevailing depression. Germany is suffering from its effect like the rest. But there are two respects in which it seems to me Germany's position differs from the position of the others. In the first place, Germany came out of the war bled white and exhausted, her territory curtailed, deprived of some of her most valuable raw materials, her colonies gone, her governmental system destroyed, her entire economic structure disrupted and dislocated, her accumulated wealth largely dissipated, and, following this, she passed through a period of inflation which rendered her money valueless. No one who did not live through that period of inflation in Germany can imagine what it meant. It wiped out whole classes and left them penniless. Prices changed every few minutes. Wages paid Saturday night lost half their purchasing power by Sunday morning. I can myself remember when a postage stamp cost eight trillion marks. As I said, unless you yourself witnessed what went on during the period, you can have no adequate conception of its destructive force. Of course, to a greater or less extent that was the condition in which all the European countries found themselves, but none of the others to quite the same degree. Those factors in themselves made recovery difficult enough. But Germany, in addition, was made to pay for the damage she had wrought. A few hundred million dollars a year, you may say, was not too great a penalty to pay in view of the loads of debt the other nations were carrying. Possibly that is true, but only if Germany was able to get her industries running again and to recover her normal industrial strength. And that has not happened. Despite her honest efforts to reestablish herself, she has not succeeded.

Bear in mind, too, that what Germany was required to pay by way of reparations had to be paid outside of Germany. That meant Germany must pay either in goods or in gold. She found it impossible to sell enough goods. Her supply of gold is sharply limited. She has kept her payments up only by borrowing, with a consequent loss of her capital. And such a process, of course, cannot be kept up indefinitely. Sooner or later it must reach an end. During this calendar year, for instance, Germany is obligated to pay the Allied Powers by way of reparation a little less than four hundred million dollars, on top of all her previous payments, and in addition she is obligated for the next sixty years to make similar payments, varying in amounts, it is true, but aggregating, in principal and interest, something more than twenty-six thousand million dollars. Possibly Germany can make these payments. I do not know. But I am sure that she cannot make them unless she can bring her productive power back somewhere near to normal. Otherwise she will simply be drained dry. The plain truth is that Germany has paid her creditors more than she could induce them to take from her in the form of goods. Her capital has been drawn upon to furnish the difference. And in the doing she has lost, in no small degree, all those imponderables which surround credit and give it life. How long, I ask you, can we, as reasonable human beings, expect that process to continue?

The second respect in which the position of the German people differs from that of the others concerns the war guilt charged against her. There is no power strong enough to force a people to pay a debt unless they are willing to pay it. And it may be in the end that we shall find the most formidable obstacle of all, as affecting the willingness of the German people to continue reparation payments, is the fact that the huge sums fastened on them by way of reparations are fastened on them, not because Germany lost the war, but because, as stated in the treaty of peace, Germany alone bears the guilt of the war. Now I need not tell you that the German people not only do not believe this but passionately resent it. Nor, I suspect, do any competent students of the facts now believe such a statement to be true. To base the claim for reparation payments simply on that guilt, on what they believe to be a political lie, the Germans regard as unfair and dishonest. They will do all in their power to perform a reasonable task. But when after trial that task appears to them impossible of performance, I am afraid that, very much as we would do ourselves, they will turn from it in anger and despair. I cannot think of anything more unfortunate for the world than the collapse of Germany at the present moment. And that collapse, unless some help is extended her, must not be regarded either as impossible or perhaps far removed in time.

Twelve years after the war the situation is not improving and may be changing for the worse. Germany, I am inclined to believe, has been pushed about as far as she can go. That this is partly her own fault, I have no doubt whatever. That, however, does not affect the net result. I can think of no good to the world which would come from Germany's complete break-down. I do not like to think of the possible effect on Western civilization of Central Europe in social chaos. But of this I do feel sure—such events would not aid us or the other nations toward economic recovery.

If Germany is to be afforded relief by the remission or suspension of her reparation payments for two years or five years, or until her economic and financial situation is sufficiently improved to enable her again to take up the burden of those payments without probable collapse, that relief must be afforded by all the nations concerned and not by America alone. We should be prepared, it seems to me, if the other nations are ready, to make our contribution. I am not sure that we are so prepared. I am sure only that we ought to be.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

President Hoover's Record

II. President Hoover's Foreign Policy*

By JOHN B. WHITTON

A FOREIGN policy in the main disappointing has been pricked out by the Hoover Administration. It is true that certain notable achievements deserve warm praise. A new spirit, particularly a sincere effort to understand the viewpoints of foreign countries, distinguished Mr. Hoover from his predecessor. His policy toward Latin America, with some exceptions, has been broad-minded and progressive. On the other hand, in most of the expressions of his foreign policy Mr. Hoover has been a great disappointment, even to many of his warmest friends. His treatment of the World Court, the proposed consultative pact, and the tariff, for example, has been a severe blow to the cause of peace. Nor could Mr. Hoover parry the blame by seeking shelter behind outworn traditions of isolation, or that really formidable obstacle, the United States Senate. For in notable instances the fault has rested upon the shoulders of a timorous President, obsessed by personal timidity or political fear.

I. Latin American Relations

Progress and retrogression, boldness and timidity, wisdom and indiscretion—this curious melange so typical of Mr. Hoover's own paradoxical character—mark his foreign policy generally. This is admirably exemplified in his Latin American policy. The President approached these perilously delicate problems with a serious purpose and open mind almost unique in our history. By embarking upon his good-will tour, he did more than avoid the army of office-seekers waiting at home. He desired to study our Latin American relations on the spot, and gain thereby a personal understanding of the existing difficulties. Even of greater importance to our southern neighbors, to whom questions of form are so vital, Mr. Hoover was making a gracious gesture which they appreciated deeply, and will not soon forget. It is true, however, that his avowed purpose—the spreading of good-will—would have come nearer achievement had he been better advised. He needed some Western Pierre de Fouquières, the famous master of ceremonies attached to the President of France, to guide him through the shoals of diplomatic precedence and international courtesy. For example, by stopping at San José, the capital of Costa Rica, Mr. Hoover unwittingly caused an affront to less-favored Central American republics. Nevertheless, his pre-inauguration tour was, in the main, a success. He learned personally of certain defects, notably our inadequate diplomatic service, which he has worked diligently to remedy. Finally, although handicapped by the platitudinous words and blundering acts of his predecessor, he seems to have convinced Latin America of his good faith.

Mr. Hoover has materially strengthened our diplomatic service in Latin America. In the past great harm has been done our legitimate interests by intrusting important diplomatic posts to incompetent political appointees. When a new revolution creates delicate questions of law and policy, it is unfortunate to have on the spot a minister whose sole bid for fame is his prowess as a poker player. The President has sought a remedy for this situation. In his message of December 3, 1929, he promised to "secure men long experienced in our diplomatic service, who speak the languages of the peoples to whom they are accredited, as chiefs of our diplomatic missions in these [Latin American] states." In other words, the President believes a diplomat should be competent—an excellent principle which, alas, he disregarded when he filled most of the major European ambassadorships! But in Latin America he has changed most of the heads of mission, and has replaced them with career men who know the local language. This is an immense improvement. Some of his appointees, however, seem to have few qualities other than the fact that they are career men and excellent linguists. Their ability properly to handle a delicate situation has never been demonstrated. On the other hand, if they are the best men available, neither the President nor the State Department is to blame. At all events, it is highly significant that while Latin American posts used to be shunned and abhorred, today they are actually sought out by ambitious career men.

But the greatest accomplishment of the Administration is a new policy toward the troubled republics of Central America and the Caribbean. President Hoover is responsible for a series of acts which almost amount to non-intervention. This forward policy is well illustrated in Haiti. The President met unrest and disorder there, not by an increase of force or an intensification of oppression, but by sending the Forbes Commission. Treating this body with more consideration than some of his domestic "fact-finding commissions," Mr. Hoover followed its excellent advice by providing for new elections, the restoration of a democratic regime, and the replacement of the military commissioner by a regular minister. Mr. Dana G. Munro was given this post. The fact that the elections returned to power officials firmly opposed to our policy did not deter the President from his purpose. Nor did he refuse to accept as Minister from Haiti M. Dantes Bellegarde, although the latter had been remarkably loud and bitterly frank in his attacks on our Haitian policy. Mr. Hoover also appointed the Moton Commission to investigate the educational system, nor did he flinch when this body brought in a long series of recommendations which exposed serious errors in our administration. On the other hand, he did blunder last November by attempting to appoint an undesirable American as the head of agricultural education, and thus unnecessarily caused the resignation of the Haitian Cabinet. But we have gone ahead with our plans to withdraw, and have promised to be out of Haiti by 1936.

* The second of a series of ten articles on President Hoover's Record. The third, on Mr. Hoover's Economics, by Henry Raymond Mussey, will appear in our next issue.

The present article was written, of course, before President Hoover proposed a one-year suspension of payments on war debts and reparations.—Editor The Nation.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In Nicaragua, too, the Administration has promised to leave the country. After the elections of November, 1932, we shall have no more marines to fight their way through the swamps in search of Sandino. To that end we are busy organizing a local *guardia* to maintain order. On the other hand, we may find difficulty in keeping out. If, in accord with Mr. Hoover's apparent determination, we insist upon building the Nicaraguan canal, we shall be forced into such intimate relationship with the local state as to make it little more than a protectorate. The fear of the "Colossus of the North" which Mr. Hoover is resolutely striving to assuage would then break out afresh. Furthermore, Nicaragua is far from pacified. Despite the loss of over 100 marines and 3,000 Nicaraguans, Sandino is still at large. Finally, it would seem difficult for us to refrain from meddling in the affairs of Nicaragua so long as we remain faithful to the policy of recognition which, illogically enough, we apply in Central America alone and nowhere else in the world. If we may judge from past experience, this policy may oblige us to interfere in local politics, often to the detriment of the interests of both the little republic and our own country. It may force us, perhaps against our own desires, toward renewed intervention. Then will come the real test of the new policy.

In other respects the tendency of our policy seems to be away from intervention. In Panama a revolution ended quickly in a change of regime. But we did not intervene. That we should remain neutral in a country wherein we have such vital interests is a good omen for the future. The same may be said of Santo Domingo, the seat of former interventions on our part. There another successful revolution occurred, and we did not intervene. Finally, our State Department published the famous Clark Memorandum, thus apparently binding the present Administration to a significant interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine. In this document it was denied that an intervention in a disordered country could be justified, as a corollary of the Monroe Doctrine, as being necessary in order to forestall a possible European intervention. Here the Administration might have removed a thorn long festering in the side of our southern neighbors. But the thorn will remain as long as these states know that we have on tap other excuses for intervention. We can allege, as we have done before, the necessity either of protecting American lives or of safeguarding the Panama Canal. Latin Americans may remember, too, that Mr. Kellogg invoked, as one pretext for going into Nicaragua, the danger of bolshevism!

II. The London Naval Treaty

The London naval treaty is claimed by the Administration as an outstanding achievement. Whether or not these pretensions are wholly justified, Mr. Hoover does deserve great credit for the London conference and its results. The President carried on the Rapidan negotiations with skill and tact, and thereby quickened immeasurably our friendship with Britain. Furthermore, he appointed as delegates to London men of high distinction and broad experience; if they did not always live up to their reputations it was not the President's fault. Unlike Mr. Wilson at Versailles, Mr. Hoover saw to it that all parties were represented on the delegation.

The President was less prudent, however, when he sought to defend the treaty. He was indiscreet in comparing the tonnage authorized at London with that proposed by the British at the Geneva conference of 1927. Although he was thus able to show a reduction of over 500,000 tons, his position looked rather lame when it appeared that the British proposals at Geneva were highly exaggerated and had never been seriously considered. It was noted also that our fleet, at the opening of the London conference, was only 7,000 tons above the tonnage to which we were entitled under the London treaty. The claim that economies would be realized under the new accord was not very convincing before the revelation that it would cost us over a billion dollars to build up to the treaty limits. On the other hand, it is legitimate to hope that the treaty will initiate such an era of good feeling that the Powers will refrain from constructing up to the legal limit. Certainly we have achieved naval parity with the greatest sea Power, and have established a stable equilibrium in relation to Japan. Furthermore, the way is paved for naval agreement between France and Italy. Above all, that step was taken which, if the general disarmament conference of 1932 has any chance to succeed, was absolutely essential. Finally, no battleships are likely to be built before 1936, the stabilization of the great naval fleets of the world has been effected, and, in fact if not in law, substantial economies are almost bound to result. The naval-armaments race, at least for the moment, has been halted.

These are substantial gains. Due credit therefor should be accorded the Administration. But criticism, as well as praise, should be bestowed where it is deserved. It is hard to forget that President Hoover, in his Armistice Day address in 1929, declared as follows: "We will reduce our naval strength in proportion to any other. Having said that, it only remains for the others to say how low they will go. *It cannot be too low for us.*" (Italics mine.) Utterly inconsistent with this pronouncement was our stand at London on battleships and aircraft carriers. We prevented the general abolition of the battleship. We alone opposed the plan to reduce the limit for aircraft carriers from 135,000 tons to 100,000 tons.

But our most extraordinary failing at London was with relation to the great vital problem of disarmament—security, sanctions, and the freedom of the seas. This, together with the question of Franco-Italian parity, was the very crux of the situation. Our delegation did not seem to realize this truth. With respect to these major questions they arrived at London apparently unprepared. Above all, they were not ready to meet the proposal which was inevitable and unavoidable: that in case of a collective war waged against an aggressor nation the United States should promise that after determining for itself who was the aggressor, it would not trade with the latter. The circumstances are inexorable: France will not disarm without security; security is impossible without the active assistance of Great Britain against the aggressor; Great Britain refuses to promise such support so long as it fears a clash with the United States over the freedom of the seas. The force of these truths our Administration has not realized. In fact, again and again Mr. Hoover has stated that there are two roads toward peace: the European, founded upon the use of force against the aggressor, and our own, based on mobilizing public opinion against a wrongdoer. While he has refused to

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

travel the European road, Mr. Hoover, unlike Mr. Coolidge, has shown an admirable spirit of deference toward the European viewpoint. Nevertheless, he cannot fully understand Europe's problems, or he would not have made the proposal, in two successive Armistice Day addresses, for food-ship immunity, when it was clear that this plan was opposed not only to the sanctions system and modern conceptions of warfare, but to public opinion generally in Europe.

Our policy at London in this matter was vacillating, to say the least. At first we declined absolutely to consider any proposal for cooperation with Europe's efforts to enforce peace through collective action. In fact, we even opposed the project for a consultative pact. Our position in this respect was pitifully weak. First we claimed that a consultative pact would be as dangerous as the Entente Cordiale, although the two agreements were so utterly different that the analogy seemed almost silly. Then we found ourselves in a most illogical position: we could not explain why, having already accepted a four-Power consultative pact for the Pacific, we could not do likewise for the Atlantic. Everyone realized, too, that without a consultative pact the Washington arms treaty could never have been achieved. It is true that at the last moment Mr. Stimson did execute a right-about-face and imply that we might consider some kind of consultative agreement. But this move, made by our London delegation, did not have the support of Washington. Moreover, it came too late to save the five-Power treaty. The matter is still of first importance. It is bound to come up again in 1932 at the general disarmament conference. Our Administration might as well realize at once that real disarmament cannot come without security, and that security is impossible without the active cooperation of the United States. Here is a magnificent opportunity for executive leadership, if courageous and enlightened.

III. International Cooperation

In the general field of international cooperation the ledger of the Administration again shows both credit and debit items. With the rest of the world we cooperate heartily by sending official delegations to numerous international conferences. We collaborate with practically all League of Nations activities of a non-political nature. In the realm of disarmament, although this question is largely political, we are working in cordial and useful partnership with League organs. Again and again Mr. Hoover has lauded the Briand-Kellogg Pact, and has warmly favored implementing it through disarmament, arbitration, and conciliation.

On the other hand, friends of the League of Nations cannot forget that the President, in speaking of that institution, said in 1920: "I believe it is the hope of practically the whole of the American people that we may enter upon this great experiment in its broad sense." He also declared: "The essential thing is that the Republican Party has pledged itself . . . that they undertake the fundamental mission to put into living being the principle of an organized association of nations for the preservation of peace. The carrying out of that promise is *the test of the entire sincerity, integrity, and statesmanship of the Republican Party.*" (Italics mine.) And yet Mr. Hoover has not advanced us one step toward the League!

The Hawley-Smoot tariff bill, despite protests from twenty foreign countries, finally became law, and was immediately followed by reprisals in a dozen countries. Nothing in years, except our attitude toward the inter-Allied debts, has done so much to make us feared and disliked abroad, and generally considered the international dog-in-the-manger par excellence. But the President, who certainly must have foreseen the dangers to our international relations, not only failed to veto the bill, but throughout the entire tariff fight showed an amazing lack of constructive leadership.

Timorous again, he has given only the most guarded—we almost said half-hearted—encouragement to plans for mobilizing public opinion against a violator of the Briand-Kellogg Pact. This hesitation is regrettable. It is incomprehensible, too, when we consider that twice the Administration took the initiative in reminding China and Russia, at blows over the Chinese-Eastern Railway dispute, of their obligations under the pact. Weak in words, somewhat stronger in acts, the policy of the Administration lacks the certainty and consistency which are essential if the anti-war treaty is to become a vital force for peace.

In this matter of collective measures for peace the most disappointing expression of the President's foreign policy has been his attitude toward the World Court. As early as December 9, 1929, with admirable promptness, our representatives signed the protocols which, based on the Root plan, provided for our entrance into the Permanent Court of International Justice. In his message of December 3, 1929, the President had enthusiastically praised the court, and had promised to submit the protocols to the Senate "when it is convenient to deal with it." But he actually waited over a year before fulfilling this promise. It was only on December 10, 1930, that he submitted the protocols to the Senate. While his message praised the court, it did so without enthusiasm, almost without conviction. This was to be expected, for it had already been announced from Washington that the submission was to be a mere gesture of good faith toward those who supported the court!

The President refrained from submitting the protocols during the 1929-30 session for *fear* of compromising the approval of the London naval treaty. He did not want the protocols considered in the 1930-31 session for *fear* of interfering with appropriation and emergency measures. He also *feared* that a special session might have been necessitated. Friends of the court were convinced, however, that a President less obsessed by political fears would have made a more valiant and more effective fight for ratification. It is not easy to understand why his speeches of December, 1930, were less enthusiastic for the court than his words of December, 1929. Above all, it is not clear why, if the President could call the Senate *alone* in order to consider the naval treaty, thereby avoiding the dangers of a special session, he could not have done likewise for the court. Here the fault does not rest with the Senate. Nor can our inaction be explained as a corollary of the overworked doctrine of American isolation. The fact that five years after the Senate, by a vote of 76 to 17, voted for adherence to the court, consideration of the protocols has again been postponed for at least a year, and that we have thus fallen still farther behind in the general world movement for the peaceful settlement of international disputes, would seem to be the fault of the President himself.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Free Speech in Childhood

By BERTRAND RUSSELL

I WAS brought up on the great Liberal watchwords, of which freedom of speech was one of the chief. But like all the other liberties of the Victorian Age, there was a catch in it. Adults were to have freedom of speech, but only after they had listened for twenty-one years to all their elders saying "Hush! hush!" whenever they opened their lips. The result was what is called liberty without license, that is, liberty without knowing how to use it. Our age has not the capacity for compromise that belonged to the age of our grandfathers. Most people have ceased to believe in free speech, while those who continue to believe in it, of whom I am one, believe that it is good even for children.

At Beacon Hill School, on the South Downs, my wife and I are putting into practice our theories of education. We are now at the end of the fourth year, and are beginning to be in a position to say something of results. The children in our school are not completely free, as some newspaper reports have represented them as being, but they do have complete freedom of speech. No child is ever told "You ought not to *say* that." I have met people who imagined that they practiced this policy, but in general they deceived themselves. Almost everybody has a theory as to what children are like, and is displeased when children say things tending to disprove this theory. And although we can all remember despising our own parents and teachers, we like to think that the young whose parents and teachers we are have an attitude totally unlike that which we had in youth. It is thought also that while freedom of speech, in general, is all very well, it must, of course, be subject to the limitations imposed by good taste. At Beacon Hill School such limitations are not imposed. There is no check upon irreverence toward elders and betters, no check upon scientific curiosity, and no check upon the choice of words.

The advantages of this system are numerous. In the first place, it is more or less possible, within limits, to know what the children are thinking. The technique of psychoanalysis has been invented to undo the effects of the "Hush! hush!" policy by teaching people to say what hitherto they have only thought. We think it is rather a mistake to give people an expensive education in concealment resulting in nervous disorders, and then give them an expensive reeducation to break down the concealment and possibly cure the nervous disorders. When children are left free as regards their language, they say from time to time such things as Freudian textbooks assert that they must be thinking; but being able to express their thoughts freely, they are not obliged to give them some fantastic form and become to that extent out of touch with reality.

I regard a robust sense of reality as a very valuable possession. Children are, to begin with, ignorant but full of scientific curiosity. The purpose of conventional education is to leave them still ignorant, but to destroy their scientific curiosity. For this there are various motives, political, religious, and moral, but all of them have their source in a deep-seated fear of reality. The orthodox view seems to be that God made the world, but that it is so horrid we had better know as little about it as possible. For my part, I accept neither premise nor conclusion in this argument. By the mere tolerance of free speech we avoid destroying the natural scientific impulses of children.

I am often asked: "What will happen to your children when they are brought into contact with the real world?" People have an idea that we are creating an artificial paradise, from which they will emerge to find to their surprise that the world contains evils. I consider, on the contrary, that this is the usual practice in education, and that our peculiarity consists in not presenting a fairy-tale world to the child's imagination. In ordinary education the child is brought up to believe, or at least to pretend to believe, that his parents and teachers are impeccable, that his country is always right, that statesmen of his own country and political party are invariably high-minded, that the wicked are easily discerned and invariably defeated in the end, and that only persons of rare depravity such as one is very unlikely to meet would be guilty of any sexual irregularity. Captains of industry, proprietors of great newspapers, admirals, generals, privy councilors, and such are represented as invariably guided by the loftiest public spirit. When the young man goes out into the world and begins to see through all these amiable falsehoods, he almost inevitably becomes a cynic.

From a narrowly educational point of view the effects of free speech are amazingly good, not only as regards the scientific outlook, but also in literary ways. To begin with the scientific aspect. The absence of the sex taboo is much more important than is generally thought, especially, I think, for girls. Most boys who have a scientific bent are interested primarily in machines, where the sex taboo is of no hindrance. We find accordingly that civilizations which are dominated by the machine are an outcome of Puritanism. Girls, however, if they have a scientific bent, tend as a rule to be biological in their interests. The teaching of biology is rendered very difficult by the sex taboo. Anatomy and physiology as presented in books designed for children always stop short at a certain point. The children perceive this, and conclude that the matters omitted are not suitable for scientific treatment; they think about them all the more, but fantastically, not rationally. The fantastic ideas that they acquire in childhood sink gradually into the unconscious, whence they dominate adult behavior, making it the ridiculous and irrational absurdity that it generally is. And in this process the scientific interests of intelligent girls are blocked. If later on they study, say, medicine, they have to overcome inhibitions, which they can do only with the intellect, not with the feelings. A doctor's understanding of a patient's body ought to be effected not only by the brain but also by the viscera. As a rule, however, the viscera and the brain have become disconnected as a result of early taboos.

As regards literature, the children's diction is exact and expressive, their emotions clothe themselves spontaneously in appropriate language, and they do not acquire that bookishness which is the bane of artificial culture. They produce

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

poems which are suggested by the ordinary sights and events of their everyday life, and not by imitation of some poet who imitated some poet who imitated some poet who imitated Homer. The only respect in which they imitate Homer is that most of their poems are produced not by a single author, but by a syndicate. The same thing applies to plays. Each term they compose a play in which, broadly speaking, each actor invents his or her own part, though other children may on occasion contribute suggestions. They make their own costumes, and in general put in a few songs for which they compose the music. They used to insist upon everybody dying at the end, but now they are generally content with one murder. In poetry, however, they are much more serious. Some poems are individual, but more frequently they sit round in a group and all contribute, though the subject may be suggested by one among them. The oldest among them is just eleven, but he is not a great contributor to the poems. In fact the two best poets are only seven years old. This aspect of their work is best illustrated by an example.

IN THE GRAVEYARD

Sitting on a gravestone
I saw an old crone,
Counting yew berries
And shriveled-up cherries,
Weaving nettles
And tearing petals.

"Have you seen my husband
Wandering around,
Ghost from the graveyard
Out of the ground?"
I answered: "No, crone,
Nothing I've seen
Except one shin-bone
With flesh between."

Up rose the moon high;
Three shadows danced by:
One was her husband,
One was her child,
One was her love-bird
Weird and wild.

She threw
Cherries at her husband,
Berries at her child,
And a little shirt of nettles
For her love-bird wild.

I could give many other examples, but this ought to suffice to dispel the idea that a scientific attitude is inimical to the imagination. I firmly believe that our methods enable a child to acquire knowledge without losing the joy of life. I hoped that this might be the case when we founded the school, but my hopes are now confirmed by nearly four years' experience.

Yellow-Dog Contracts for Teachers

By HENRY R. LINVILLE

DURING the school year of 1929-30 another mile post of reaction was set up on the Pacific Coast, this time in Washington. The State Supreme Court on December 2, 1930, upheld the decision of a lower court which had dismissed an injunction sought by the Teachers Union of Seattle to restrain the school board of that city from denying employment to members of the American Federation of Teachers. Mr. Justice Beals dissented.

In May, 1928, the Seattle school board adopted the following resolution:

> That no person be employed hereafter, or continued in the employ of the district, as a teacher while a member of the American Federation of Teachers or any local thereof; and that before any election shall be considered binding, such teacher shall sign a declaration to the following effect: "I hereby declare that I am not a member of the American Federation of Teachers or any local thereof, and will not become a member during the term of this contract."

The opinion of the majority of the court admits the existence of the statute guaranteeing the right of membership in unions:

> It shall be lawful for working men and women to organize themselves into or carry on labor unions, for the purpose of lessening the hours of labor or increasing the wages or bettering the conditions of the members of such organizations; or carry out their legitimate purposes by any lawful means.

The court maintains, however, that this statute has no application to the case under consideration, since the school board is "not undertaking to discharge anyone, but is only defining its course in exercising its power to employ in the future." Neither does the Fourteenth Amendment to the Constitution of the United States protect union teachers in the right of union membership. The right of freedom of contract is held to be inviolable, and the court cites with approval the decision of the Illinois Supreme Court in 1917 validating the "Loeb rule" of the Chicago board:

> The board has the absolute right to decline to employ or reemploy any applicant for any reason whatever, or for no reason at all. . . . It is no infringement upon the constitutional rights of anyone for the board to decline to employ him as a teacher in the schools, and it is immaterial whether the reason for the refusal to employ him is because the applicant is married or unmarried, is of fair complexion or dark, is or is not a member of a trade union, or whether no reason is given for such refusal. The board is not bound to give any reason for its action. It is free to contract with whomsoever it chooses. Neither the Constitution nor the statute places any restriction upon this right of the board to contract, and no one has any grievance which the courts will recognize simply because the board of education refuses to contract with him or her. Questions of policy are solely for the determination of the board, and when they have once been determined by it the courts will not inquire into their propriety.

These words indicate accurately the actual legal situation of teachers in these States.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Justice Beals, dissenting, agrees that "both the school board and the teachers are free agents and are at liberty to enter into such contracts or not, as they may desire." He believes, however, that the question presented goes farther than this, saying:

> There is a great difference between the exercise of the judgment and discretion which school boards must exercise in contracting with teachers and the laying down in advance of a definite rule whereby certain persons are excluded from such employment for reasons having nothing to do with their moral or physical characteristics, their educational qualifications, or their general ability as teachers. . . . It must certainly be admitted that a school board could not resolve that it would employ as a teacher no one who was over six feet or under five feet four inches in height, or who possessed or failed to possess some other physical characteristic wholly irrelevant to the teaching ability of its possessor. The action of a board in insisting upon the maintenance of any such whimsical standard would certainly be restrained by the courts. . . . I am not disposed to hold that qualified and capable teachers, as a condition precedent to employment, may be required to sign such a stipulation [not to belong to a union], which it is beyond the power of the school board to enforce by discharge, if violated by the teacher.

He concludes that the school board exceeded its lawful authority, and that the judgment appealed from should be reversed.

Decisions by the Ohio Supreme Court, also cited by the Washington Supreme Court, support the Illinois court's conception of the right of school boards to impose on teachers any restriction whatever as a condition of employment. Since Justice Beals agrees with the majority in the right of freedom to contract, it is difficult to see how he can withhold acceptance of the position taken by the Supreme Courts in the three States mentioned. Furthermore, the hypothetical case of refusing employment to teachers over six feet or under five feet four in height happens to be of no help, especially as just such restrictions (against low stature) are now being set up by school boards. In fact, many new qualifications of teachers are being formulated in matters relating to physical appearance, dress, health, speech, and "personality."

Perhaps the lawyers can see (as Justice Beals does) how a teacher working under a yellow-dog contract could escape dismissal while actually belonging to a teachers' union, because of the statute guaranteeing the right to belong to trade unions. But to those familiar with the arbitrary customs of school boards there would appear to be no chance for an honest union teacher in places where the school board bans teachers' unions.

There have been many antagonistic reactions to the organization of teachers' unions in this country. Prominent educators have pointed out the "unprofessional" conduct of teachers who would organize a union, and many boards of education and other educational officers have seen such organizations as "menaces" and have accomplished their destruction in various parts of the country—in New England, the Middle West, the Far West, and the South. In the three States of Illinois, Ohio, and Washington the most powerful agency of reaction in organized society, the courts, has come to the support of these other authorities. The slow progress in the organization of teachers' unions in this country is easily understood when it is realized that the members of the profession are generally timid, unfamiliar with social problems, and easily persuaded to conform.

The locals of the American Federation of Teachers, in the fifteen years of the existence of the national organization, have put up several splendid fights for existence. In Chicago the "Loeb rule" was rendered ineffective, and even the decision of the Supreme Court of Illinois in upholding the yellow-dog contract is no longer invoked in that State. In New England the backwash of the Boston policemen's strike swept all teachers' unions out of existence, but they are coming back. In Pennsylvania a reactionary State superintendent of public instruction declared all teachers' unions unlawful, but there, too, such unions are slowly recovering. In New York the Teachers Union of New York City has fought valiantly and successfully against Lusk school laws, history-censorship bills, and numerous "strike" bills introduced by self-seeking school officials. In California teachers' unions constitute the fighting front to keep a teachers' tenure law that was won after a hard struggle.

But the struggle of a small band of not more than one hundred Seattle teachers is perhaps the most challenging of all. When the first action to enjoin the school board from enforcing the yellow-dog contract failed, the members of the union realized that they were in for a long, hard fight. It was agreed that all but one of the members should give up their membership in the union, and that the remaining one should become president of the local and with the help of other teachers, not in the employ of the school board, should hold the charter and prepare to carry the fight to the Supreme Court of the United States if necessary.

The school elections of March, 1929 and 1930, were hotly contested, the fight centering about the union issue. The liberal forces in March, 1929, succeeded in electing for a short term Judge Austin E. Griffiths, a retired judge of the Superior Court living in Seattle, who became the chief proponent of justice for the teachers. In 1930 he was defeated by a very small majority, but the showing made by the union forces was an impressive one. Moved apparently by this political situation, on January 2, 1931, the school board of Seattle lifted the ban against the union and promised that the teachers' contracts for the next school year, beginning September 1, 1931, would not contain the yellow-dog provision. Moreover, the board elected as its new president a member who was chosen two years ago by the liberal element in Seattle, the supporters of the teachers' cause. The school board earlier had granted many of the demands of the union, except increases in salaries, and had made many promotions of teachers who had been active in the union. But it now seems certain that the teacher who led this fight will not be reemployed, because an example is needed by the school board as a warning to the "rebels."

The hostile decision of the Washington Supreme Court stands, however, and there seems to be little doubt that similar decisions could be secured in other States. One possible line of action is the advocacy of laws against yellow-dog contracts in the several States, such as those recently passed in Colorado and Ohio. The popular conception of the teacher's function may have to be reversed. For a teacher in the changing social order must become a creative force, demanding and securing, as a necessary condition of meeting his social obligation, freedom to think and to teach how to think as well as how to do.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In the Driftway

PSYCHOLOGISTS have tried to explain what it is about flying that so appeals to the human mind; but they have never explained it to the Drifter. For although he has often flown by airplane, only for a few moments has he felt any relation to the earth on these aerial journeys; and one flies, in an emotional sense, only when one's movements are physically contrasted with the stability of *terra firma*. For a little while, of course, when the landing field swirls around below as you bank against the breeze, you gauge your moments by the earthly standard, and then you feel a thrill—or at any rate, the Drifter does. But, all in all, the true way to appease the eternal longing for flight is through certain devices unappreciated by the aeronautical engineers. One of these consists of a tin can tied to the foot by a piece of string, the string extending to the hand, which holds it taut. A couple of these, and you are off for a breathless escape from mundane locomotion—if you are young enough, that is.

* * * * *

EVEN if you are older than the tin-can stage, there is no need for discouragement. It came back to the Drifter once upon a time as he stood in the Prado, at Madrid, and looked hungrily at Goya's painting of the Stilt-walkers. Two men in knee breeches are strutting about on high stilts, their feet almost level with the heads of two companions who with small trumpets furnish music for the stilt dancing of the lofty entertainers. An admiring crowd of men and boys is hanging around ready, in a moment, to toss them their *centimos*. Looking at the picture, painted more than a hundred years ago, the Drifter realized the truth of Goya's understanding; for by using stilts you obtain a leverage on earth, and fly with what seems dizzying velocity to the earthbound.

* * * * *

A WEEK later the Drifter found a youth practicing this delicate art in a side street of a village in old Aragon. He found it, too, in Catalonia. Every Catalonian knows his native dances, and if you will sneak into a certain square near the waterfront of Barcelona at eleven o'clock of a Sunday morning, you will see all of them at it, one after another joining in the intricate steps as unaffectedly as an American boy "horns in" on a baseball game of choose-up-sides. In these dances you might, even now, catch sight of some elderly man with a red liberty cap hanging over one ear, with a blue peasant's blouse and nondescript trousers, leaping high into the air in a vain effort to satisfy an urge as old as humankind. But the Drifter saw, not without grinning at the ultimate triumph of the machine even here, two small boys doing far better than their old granddad by means of rude stilts on which they soared o'er hill and dale, or, to be realistic, o'er drain and gutter.

* * * * *

STILL later, in old Provence, in a twenty-foot alley selected because it was the broadest avenue in this dusty town of the Midi, the Drifter found a crowd gathered where weird music rose into the mellow air, and where, over the heads of miscellaneous Provençals, a whirling gleam of yellow and fire-red lured the curious eye. Elbowing his way amiably into the enthralled ring of onlookers, he discovered that Goya might as well be living now; for here were his stilt-walkers once more, busy in a dance of incredible abandon. One of these whirligigs was a girl of twelve, the other a madly graceful young woman who might have been a *gitana* of the Romany strain. And just to cheer the soul of Goya, should he be looking down from some Elysian eminence, two indefatigable musicians tooted on trumpet and sawed on fiddle, varying their themes, liar though you think the Drifter is, from a quaint old folk-tune of the Bouche-du-Rhône to the strains and stresses of the "Maine Stein Song." Or, shall we say, from the happy valleys of Provence to the Rudy—but no, even the Drifter will not say it.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

Not Our Business

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Your editorial Roosevelt, Ritchie, and Pinchot cannot but fill even your friends with confusion and impatience. There are those who want to follow you, and whither do you lead them but to the morass of the most futile negativism? In succession you demolish Hoover, Pinchot, Roosevelt, Ritchie, and Young. Very well, then, name your candidate. Bring him out into the open where he too can be sniped at. And having named him fight *for* him.

Wilton, Conn., June 13 THOMAS H. DICKINSON

[It is not our business to nominate. We are not a political party. We had thought all our readers were aware that *The Nation* will not support any nominee of the Republicans or Democrats.—EDITOR THE NATION.]

The Scottsboro Case

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Because I have been so busy working on the Scottsboro case, the article on that case published in your issue of June 3 has just come to my attention. With a good deal that was said I agree, but the effort to whitewash the attorney Stephen Roddy, whether that was conscious or unconscious, seems to me most unfortunate for the cause of the boys themselves, in which, as you rightly say, all of us are primarily interested.

In order to put plainly and without prejudice Mr. Roddy's connection with these cases I quote his own words:

> If I was paid down here and employed it would be a different thing, but I have not prepared this case for trial and have only been called into it by people who are interested in these boys from Chattanooga. Now, they have not given me an opportunity to prepare the case and I am not familiar with the procedure in Alabama, but I merely came down here as a friend of people who are interested and not as paid counsel. . . . I am merely here at the solicitation of people who have become interested in this case, without any payment of fee and without any preparation for trial, and I think the boys would be better off if I step entirely out of the case according to my way of looking at it and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

according to my lack of preparation of it and not being familiar with the procedure in Alabama. [Weems-Norris record, pp. 4-5.]

Mr. Roddy did not interview any of the nine defendants before their arraignment. The only time that he talked to them at all was in the courtroom, just before they were tried. At not one of the four trials at Scottsboro did Stephen Roddy, who according to his own account was entirely unprepared, ask for an adjournment in order that he might prepare. At not one of these trials did he even sum up for his clients (*cf.* Patterson record, p. 96). At not one of these trials did he make a single objection to the charge given by the judge, and it is to be remembered that these nine Negroes were being tried for an offense the punishment of which was death.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People has the four records of these trials. What does that organization think of Mr. Roddy? If *The Nation* obtained its information from the association, it is extraordinary that the article published mentioned Mr. Roddy only to praise him. Incidentally, Mr. Roddy at no time suggested that he was retained by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People and said distinctly upon the motion for a new trial on June 5 that he "was glad that he did not represent any New York organization."

I have written this not because I am assisting the International Labor Defense in connection with this case, but because I honestly believe that the difficulties in which the nine Negroes involved in the Scottsboro cases find themselves are due to the fact that at their trials—the only time when their defense could be put in in its entirety and with its full weight—no one attempted to put in that defense. This I believe has seriously prejudiced their case.

New York, June 8 CAROL WEISS KING

A Twenty-five-Year World Plan

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: To students of the world situation in agriculture, industry, and employment I should like to propose for consideration the following outline of a program:

1. That all tax bodies, local, state, and national, which have or can gain authority to do so, shall levy a tax on property for the creation of stabilization reserves.

2. That the rate of tax for this purpose shall be fixed by the taxing body in ordinary times as a very small percentage of all other taxes levied by that body, with probably a sliding scale for increasing the rate as the indices of prosperity rise. In periods of depression this tax rate should disappear altogether and give way to a flow of reserves in the opposite direction.

3. That sums collected for the stabilization reserves be invested with a view not merely to security of principal and income, but also to the prevention of wide fluctuations in flow of goods, money, credits, and services.

4. That federal, State, and local tax bodies should cooperate in supporting and creating coordinated local, State, and federal advisory bodies of quasi-experts on the prevention of periods of depression and on the expenditure of reserves for alleviating and checking such periods.

5. That this general insurance of society as a whole against extremes of depression and unemployment be supplemented by and coordinated with plans for stimulating various industries, labor unions, trade associations, and insurance companies to develop scientifically controlled small, medium, and large-scale experiments in insuring individuals against the losses of such periods of disturbance.

6. That scientific students of this problem definitely announce to the public which looks to their leadership the abandonment of any search for a specific remedy for hard times, and declare that they (the experts) are committed to a policy of developing an experimental technique and quantitative control of the flow of goods, credits, and services.

In short, it is proposed that the problem of control of business cycles be treated as a great scientific project calling for a twenty-five-year plan for the whole modern economic and industrial world.

Ellensburg, Wash., June 1 SELDEN SMYSER

Reform and Land Prices

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of June 3 you say:

> A program of this sort, as Senator La Follette has pointed out, could and should provide for financial assistance to cities and States in extending direct relief, for an extensive public-works program, for workable farm-relief legislation, reduction of the tariff, increases in the income- and inheritance-tax rates to finance public construction and direct relief, and legislation to create a national economic council to assist in stabilizing industry and agriculture.

The Nation has so much that seems good even to a radical that it should not, I think, stop short of the conclusions from its own doctrines. The foregoing is at least practicable. But would not all these remedies result mainly and eventually in raising the prices of land? Are we not entitled to know how *The Nation* stands on this question?

New York, June 10 BOLTON HALL

[*The Nation* can see no reason whatever, either in theory or in history, for believing that all these remedies would "result mainly and eventually in raising the prices of land." To contend, for example, that the increase of income-tax rates to finance direct unemployment relief would result either "mainly" or "eventually" in raising the price of land appears to us absurd. It is true, of course, that many social reforms, in addition to their other results, do raise the rent and consequently the selling price of land, but we are wholly unable to accept the contention that the landlord is the sole ultimate economic beneficiary of social progress and improvement.—EDITOR THE NATION.]

Presidential English

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your editorial, Hoover and Our Army, in the issue of May 20, the excerpt you gave from Mr. Hoover's address before the International Chamber of Commerce should be sufficient to prove to even the most obstinate that the man we have at the head of affairs has neither the capacity to think, even on elementary subjects, nor the ability to express himself with the clarity of a ten-year-old schoolboy. The amazing thing to me is that, with a heavy cordon of secretaries around him, the following was allowed to pass:

> Endeavor as we must in support of every proposal of international economic cooperation that is just to our respective peoples, yet we must recognize that reduction of this gigantic waste of competition in military establishments is in the ultimate of an importance transcendent over all other forms of such economic effort.

Michoacán, Mexico, May 19 ROYAL P. JARVIS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

No Herb of Healing

By LESLIE NELSON JENNINGS

Dig me no root that, by the moon's arcane
Indulgence, is of sovereign power to lull
Asleep the prowling Basilisk of Pain.
There is no herb of healing can annul
This that does violence to a flesh apart
From the poor effigy in whom I dwell—
An inward bleeding closer to the heart,
Sullen and slow and irremediable.

This body and breath is not my charge, nor yours.
I pit a stabler strength against the shrewd
Antagonist who spurns our paltry cures:
We have an older issue to conclude.
Living or dying, I shall ask no grace . . .
Go, take your pity to another place.

The Itching Palm

"Gimme": Or How Politicians Get Rich. By Emanuel H. Lavine. The Vanguard Press. $2.50.

UNTIL recent months it could be said truthfully that Chicago is better than its reputation and New York is worse. Chicago had a long head start in the race for stellar corruption honors because of those incomparable exhibits, Al Capone and Big Bill Thompson. Legs Diamond may be entertaining but he is a frail shadow compared to the Scarface, and Jimmy Walker never tried to bust King George on the snoot.

New York's reputation is changing now. The city's government has become a front-page national scandal on its own account. The newspapers of the hinterland gobble up the press-association dispatches about corruption in the metropolis and print them under great, gloating headlines. Tammany, as the next Presidential election may show, has returned to its former role of America's favorite political villain.

Mr. Lavine proves that the Tammany reputation is deserved. He piles the evidence high in a veritable cyclopedia of New York corruption. If the narrative has the telephonic manner of a police reporter—and Mr. Lavine has been a police reporter for twenty-five years—the style has the virtues of its defects. The spurts and jerks give life to the prose. Mr. Lavine makes no pretense to careful reflection or documentation. He hurls his facts like hand grenades and nearly all of them explode. He has packed as much rottenness into 298 pages of muckraking as I have ever seen anywhere, and as far as I have been able to check up, he tells the truth.

New York—the book is almost wholly about New York—emerges from this study as a city ruled by a shrewd and ruthless gang of political racketeers. The system of "fixing" extends from the patrolman on the beat to the Supreme Court judge, with the district leader as the pivotal figure in the hierarchy. If a lawyer wishes an appointment as judge he speaks to the district leader; if a gangster wishes acquittal he fixes it through a court clerk who is a henchman of a district leader; if a plain citizen seeks surcease from a parking ticket he joins the district leader's political club. Sometimes the district leader is paid in cash; sometimes he receives a "loan," as he did in the notorious Ewald case; sometimes he is paid on the instalment plan. A judge who failed to pay his district leader for receiving a fourteen-year term at $25,000 a year would be, in the classic language of co-leader Annie Mathews, "a rotter." The quality of judges produced by this system is indicated by the number who have been officially accused or have resigned under fire in recent months—Bertini, Crater, Vitale, Ewald, Goodman, Mancuso, McQuade, Simpson, Vause, Norris, and Silberman. The penalty for judges who neglect to pay the last instalment of their appointment price is suggested by the mysterious death of Magistrate Andrew Macreary.

More than 90 per cent of New York's 138,000 employees come under civil-service regulations, but there are enough vacant niches in the higher realms of city life to provide for the important Tammany-McCooey-Flynn henchmen by appointment and election. A district leader is commonly made a commissioner at from $10,000 to $20,000—six machine commissioners and deputy commissioners now sit in high places of the Walker administration after refusing to waive immunity before a grand jury, although the only legal reason for this refusal is that testifying might incriminate them. Minor assistants to the district leaders are commonly made aldermen at $5,000 a year for two hours a week, counting the lunch hour.

Mr. Lavine shows how this machine has brought corruption into the school system and condoned the outrages of the vice squad. Its upper ramifications include the big bankers who plundered the depositors of the Bank of United States, and the realtors who cheat the taxpayers of $25,000,000 to $30,000,000 a year through the land-condemnation racket. Whenever a wave of civic reform begins in New York, the big bounders of the law and commerce rush to obstruct a thorough investigation, and the press plays up the irrelevant pleasantries of the charming Jimmy. Samuel Untermyer, Frank P. Walsh, and George Gordon Battle laud John F. Curry as a hero for refusing to waive immunity before a grand jury!

Most of the evils described by Mr. Lavine can be traced back to the acquisitive morality of American capitalism, and the politicians' cry of "Gimme" is simply a variation of the practice of private profit in the world of business enterprise. But not all these evils can be traced to capitalism. England manages to have clean local government within capitalism, and so do most of the cities of the Continent. In the United States we have Cincinnati and Milwaukee. New York is rotten today largely because of the indifference of intelligent citizens to civic affairs. Until civic indifference becomes less fashionable, the Currys and the Walkers will continue to rule the world's greatest city—and books like Mr. Lavine's will be written every ten years.

PAUL BLANSHARD

Keynes on Money

A Treatise on Money. By John Maynard Keynes. Harcourt, Brace and Company. Two volumes. $8.

IN these two volumes Mr. Keynes presents conclusive proof of Alfred Marshall's statement that ". . . money is the center around which economic science clusters . . ." Although he has called his work "A Treatise on Money," the topics covered in it range from the functions of a "supernational bank" to the conditions under which workers will obtain the benefits of labor-saving machinery in the form of a higher standard of living.

Mr. Keynes's analysis opens with a classification of the various types of money. He shows that as types of money other than commodity money are introduced, such as notes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and bank deposits, some criteria for their management must be accepted. The conventional guide has been convertibility into gold at a fixed rate, but this method of management, Mr. Keynes holds, places too great an emphasis on gold and leads to instability of price levels; management, he maintains, should be directed chiefly toward the maintenance of the stability of the purchasing power of money. In seeking a definition of purchasing power, Mr. Keynes is led to a discussion of price indexes. He reminds us that all groups of prices do not move sympathetically, and that if they do, a time lag usually occurs. His own preference (at least in the theoretical chapters) is for an index of the cost of living.

Mr. Keynes does good service in pointing out the error of considering the "value of money" to be equivalent to the "objective mean variation of prices." This particular view assumes that by averaging price changes we arrive at something new, namely, variations in the value of money. The unsatisfactoriness of this approach is that it leads to a simple quantity theory. For on the assumption that value and quantity vary inversely, it would only be necessary to control the quantity to control the value. This theory does not distinguish clearly between the movements of various groups of prices, and, in fact, most writers who expound it usually come to the conclusion that it doesn't much matter which prices are included in the index so long as a sufficiently large number are taken.

Mr. Keynes does not rely on the quantity of money to explain the variations in its purchasing power. The main theme of his theory is that disequilibria in the rates of saving and investment cause changes in the prices of consumers' goods. At first this might appear confusing; for, one may ask, how in a modern society can one save without investing, short of hoarding? But the distinction is perfectly legitimate and clear as the author draws it. Saving is the negative act of refraining from consuming. It results from the individual's decision as to how much of his monetary income he will devote to consumption. Investment, on the other hand, is the result of enterprise, and is the positive act of directing economic goods and services into the form of capital goods.

It follows from this theory that ". . . the conditions for the equilibrium of the purchasing power of money require that the banking system should so regulate its rate of lending that the value of investment is equal to savings." Since the rate of investment depends on the rate of interest, the central bank should lower its rate of discount and make open-market purchases when the level of prices is falling, in order to encourage investment. This will tend to restore equilibrium between savings and investment and thus correct the disequilibrium which is causing the price decline. Such is the essence of the theory.

Examination shows that it rests on many doubtful beliefs regarding the causation and sequences of events. It is assumed that the central bank is able to control the market rates of interest through changes in its own rediscount rate and holdings of bills and securities. Certainly our Federal Reserve banks have not been able to do this at all times. Further, the guide to the policy of the central bank must be the condition of equilibrium between savings and investment, but Mr. Keynes himself points out that the rediscount rate has also the functions of protecting the gold reserve and regulating the quantity of credit.

These objectives are not always harmonious. The further transitions in the sequence of events require that the market rates of interest induce changes in the rates for long-term loans, and that these in turn alter the rate of investment. Finally, the change in the rate of investment must alter the prices of consumers' goods through changes in money incomes relative to the quantity of consumers' goods. The chain of events is too long and the links too weak. If the rate of investment is to be controlled, it would be more effective to regulate it directly. Recognition of this leads Mr. Keynes to suggest that this might be made a government function.

But this is not the end of the complications with which the theory is confronted. The international character of price movements must be considered. It follows that the complete national autonomy of any central bank is unlikely. Confronted with this difficulty, Mr. Keynes seeks a way out by proposing a "super-national bank." In seeking a criterion for its policy, he abandons the consumption index in favor of a wholesale-price index. This completely destroys the force of his theory and places him in the same position as those whom he has previously criticized.

In broadening his discussion to include credit-cycle theory, Mr. Keynes strays from the straight path of stable purchasing power to suggest that inflation might at times be beneficial. His approach goes through several modifications. At first he concludes that if inflation could be carefully engineered, lack of sufficient voluntary savings might be offset. However, deflation is not to be permitted to follow. Later in the discussion inflation is recommended as a corrective of a previous deflation. In the face of these proposals Mr. Keynes recommends in the second volume that a stable price level should be sought.

The "Treatise" is valuable in the emphasis which it places on factors other than the quantity of money and credit as influences on prices. The stress placed on the necessity for equilibrium between savings and investment is particularly important. Furthermore, the interrelations and complexity of the price structure are fully brought out. In attempting to establish the sequence of events essential to his theory, Mr. Keynes presents many thoughtful chapters on banking theory and policy. Several chapters are devoted to statistics, some primary and some secondary.

A chapter is devoted to historical cases, which concludes with a discussion of the present depression. Mr. Keynes attributes the slump of 1930 to the deterrent effects on investment of the high rates of interest which preceded it. Many would object to this on the ground that investment during the period preceding 1930 was going forward faster than savings. He does not discuss this possibility but on the other hand recommends that the disequilibrium be corrected by the Federal Reserve banks. They should make open-market purchases in such volume that the member banks would have more funds than they can lend at short term, thus forcing them into the securities market. This would lower the rates for long-term loans and thus encourage investment. In this manner equilibrium would be reestablished between savings and investment. As a matter of fact, all that has happened during the past year or so as a result of just such a policy is the establishment of ridiculously low rates of interest for some types of short-term loans. One is reminded by some of Mr. Keynes's theories of the remark made by W. Stanley Jevons many years ago: "There are men who spend their lives and fortunes in endeavoring to convince a dull world that poverty can be abolished by the issue of printed bits of paper. I know one gentleman who holds that exchequer bills are the panacea for the evils of humanity."

The early chapters of Volume I give promise of a well-knit theory of savings and investment. Unfortunately, Mr. Keynes does not fulfil these expectations. Perhaps he is too preoccupied with an attempt to find a simple solution for the immediate difficulties with which England is confronted as a result of the readjustment in world economic relations since the war. From the point of view of his theory, the chief of these is the Bank of England's loss of control over the international monetary situation. The result is that protection of its gold reserve demands a relatively high bank rate, while domestic conditions require a low one.

WILLIAM E. DUNKMAN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Why Write Fiction?

Life Among the Lowbrows. By Eleanor Rowland Wembridge. Houghton Mifflin Company. $2.50.

AFTER one has finished Mrs. Wembridge's book, so sane, so just, so coolly kind, and at the same time so interesting, one is brought to the conclusion that the novelists who strive for realism with particular emphasis on what has been called the seamy side of life might just as well shut up shop and go home. These tales of girls who got into trouble with the law prove anew that truth effectively told is not only stranger but on the whole more absorbing than fiction.

"The characters in the following sketches," Mrs. Wembridge says, "were all dull people, and most of them were exasperating besides. All honor to the sober and kindly citizens whom Nature slighted when she made their minds, and yet who somehow muddle through. That these pages are largely devoted to those who muddled rather badly is only because, whatever their limitations, the sober and kindly rarely get arrested, and therefore I do not know them quite so well." With this disarming preface, we make our bow to the moronic, the neurotic, the irresponsible, the unsuccessful. We see them in their pitiful and unhappy struggles with living, at which they mostly fail, and with the law, which they mostly do not understand.

Mrs. Wembridge makes clear how absurd it is to expect them to cope with the exigencies of the world as they, in their incapacity and poverty, must inevitably meet it. When two of these waifs, united in holy matrimony and expected to live within their scant means of twenty dollars a week, come in contact with authority, an effort is made to make them see their own problems. Flora, the young wife, was asked: "If you have twenty dollars a week and spend fourteen a week, how long will it take you to save three hundred dollars?" The answer should be given in Mrs. Wembridge's own words:

> Flora, who had a sense of humor, could not at first get past the joke that she should ever save anything. "A lifetime," she answered, "—and a long lifetime." Then, "three hundred times fourteen." "Three hundred times fourteen *what?*" we persisted, and Flora answered "dollars." The example was written out for her, but she had completely lost the connection, and when she was again reminded . . . she answered, as if through the telephone, "2025." What she meant by that we shall never know.

Not all of them are so inept about money. A young bride who won a three-hundred-dollar prize in an exhibition dance contest rushed into Mrs. Wembridge's office, waving her check. "'I got the prize,' she shouted, 'Now Jim and I can have a baby.'" Nor are they all unaware of the problems that beset them, although their language to explain or describe them is so limited. They recognize that mothers are a problem—they work for you and you must help them all you can; and when you find your man you must leave them; and they are worrisome when they keep too desperate a curb on their daughters, and when they allow them too free a rein, when they too obviously prefer their sons, when they do not protest the brutality of a harassed and dimly understanding father. They know that sisters should not give up too much for their brothers; that "old maids" have their own particular difficulties. Fathers present a problem all their own. They "holler." What about?

> "Oh, about everything. Someone has his paper, or the kids make a lotta noise, or he don't want us to go out nights, or he just hollers to hear himself." . . . Still another [girl] gave as her three dearest wishes to have a wrist watch, to play second base on the ball team, and to have her father "always mad."
>
> "Always mad," we echoed in astonishment. "Don't you mean never mad?"
>
> "No, mad all the time," she asserted with decision. "Because when he ain't mad, he just hollers. But when he's real mad, his neck swells up so he can't get a holler out, and I wish he'd stay swelled up!"

Out of all this welter of humor and pathos, ignorance and a certain native shrewdness, Mrs. Wembridge is able to draw few conclusions. She can only predict that the unpredictable will happen. Pauline is insistent that she disposes of her person for pay only when she needs the money, for herself or for her numerous relatives. Nina insists on the exact contrary. "'Do you think I take money for it?' she demands in indignation. . . . 'When I go wild I go for fun, and because I want to. I would never be so low as to take a cent if I starved for it. . . . What jazzing round I do, I do for nothing.'" But if their morals and their manners, not to mention their behavior, are unpredictable, there is one ground on which they can be met. In a chapter called Victoria Knew Her Morons, Mrs. Wembridge declares that when all appeals have failed or are obviously meaningless, when justice and decency and honor are empty words, there remains respectability, the snob appeal. "Do you think Mrs. Governor Soandso would do that sort of thing?" the culprit is asked. And a hung head and tears are often enough the answer. Authority, unjustified and unexplained, is the only thing that these young persons understand. "You mustn't do it because it isn't done." Conventionality, hypocrisy, cant, anti-feminism, and sex-repression—one of them has often been found to work in the social redemption of one of these unfit when more modern and individual appeals failed. For in the last analysis what they lack is mind; not will, or experience, or energy, but ordinary, fourteen-year-old intelligence. They are not mentally equipped to meet the world.

Mrs. Wembridge does not know what to do with them in general. She can only describe them. And that she does supremely well.

DOROTHY VAN DOREN

A Great Railway Builder

Henry Villard and the Railways of the Northwest. By James Blaine Hedges. Yale University Press. $3.

THE name of Henry Villard is inseparably connected with the history of transcontinental railway development in the Northwest, and Professor Hedges gives in this book a fully documented account, notably clear in view of the complexities of the subject, of Villard's connection with the transportation undertakings in which he was for years a commanding figure. The story begins with 1873 when Villard, who was visiting in Germany after nineteen years' of romantic experience in the United States, was sent back as agent of a committee of German holders of bonds of the Oregon and California Railroad on which interest was in default. Investigation convinced him that some of the European investments were safe, and his own career of railway promotion and construction was before long under way.

The key to the twenty-year struggle in which Villard engaged in found in the fact that the Columbia River gateway and Puget Sound "offered alluring opportunities to competing railroad builders who sought to center the trade of the region at one port or the other." Villard made Portland the center of the network of rail and water lines which he eventually controlled, and added the Northern Pacific to his other interests, completing it to Portland only when it decided to build to the Sound. A later Northern Pacific management actually built the competing line, whereupon Villard arranged an alliance between the Union Pacific and the Oregon and Transcontinental

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which gave an independent connection with Portland. In 1884 he resigned the presidency of the Northern Pacific, and when he again entered the field as a railway power a deadly competition had replaced the monopoly which had seemed to him the best solution of the railway problem. Although he was not at that time directly connected with either of the competing systems, he was the agent of German investors, and it is Professor Hedges's opinion that "probably no railway promoter in the Pacific Northwest ever strove so earnestly for the good of all" as did Villard when, from 1887 to 1889, he sought for harmony and fair competition through the device of a joint lease.

The good fortune of success, however, was not to be his. Both the Union and Northern Pacific went down under the weight of millions expended in the premature construction of branches, and Portland, which had accounted Villard as its greatest benefactor, was alienated. Professor Hedges is chary of personal judgments, but his book nevertheless makes clear the high-mindedness of Villard's large plans and the skill and courage with which he prosecuted them until a too powerful opposition, political, railway, and financial, overwhelmed both him and them.

WILLIAM MACDONALD

French Revolutionists

After Robespierre: The Thermidorean Reaction. By Albert Mathiez. Alfred A. Knopf. $5.

A Biographical History of the French Revolution. By J. Mills Whitham. The Viking Press. $5.

WITH the appearance of M. Mathiez's new volume in a very adequate English translation, his readers on this side of the Atlantic have an opportunity to see what he makes of the period that followed the death of his hero. His method, as always, is that of the "scientific historian"; his temper, as of old, that of the prophet who summons the heavens to fall upon the corrupt set of schemers who turned upon Robespierre and prevented the establishment of his Republic of Virtue. Anyone with a minimum of historical training can use Mathiez as a model to prove that the objective historian, controlled by rigorously scientific laws, does not exist. Bias and partisanship fairly ooze out of his impartial presentation of facts. But it is a persuasive bias, a vigorous and erudite partisanship, a prejudice nourished by a lifetime of the most productive and the most illuminating scholarship of our generation. Partisanship, that is, disbelieving in the prejudices of someone else, and bias, that is, strong convictions of your own, are the very essence of the matter when you deal with fundamentals; and what could be more fundamental than the concepts underlying the organization of a new social order?

Mathiez's account is unquestionably the most penetrating study yet written of internal politics in France during the fifteen-month period that followed the fall of Robespierre on the 9th of Thermidor. He shows us a France ruled by trimmers, by repentant Terrorists, by unscrupulous politicians whose highest conviction was self-preservation; who undid the institutions of the Terror Government which they helped establish, who reopened the churches without believing in the church, who recalled the Girondins whom they had persecuted, who gave an amnesty to the royalists in the Vendée, and who fell, like avenging furies, upon their former colleagues who were not adroit enough to show that Robespierre was responsible for their own acts of violence. It is a terrific indictment that he has drawn, a sordid picture of the decomposition of representative government. But his study is not complete enough. We should like an appreciation of the sincere and uncalculating popular desire to return to middle-class normality after the sadistic rule of revolutionary idealists. We should like also more recognition of the fact that even though the morally bankrupt conquerors of Robespierre dammed the waters of pure—and homicidal—revolutionary idealism, they still performed an indispensable service in preserving the republic and the major achievements of the revolution.

Mr. Whitham is a novelist turned explorer, a fisher of souls, who traces the course of the revolution by conducting "psychological inquiries" in an effort to discover how each of the outstanding figures of the period "fulfilled his destiny and helped to determine his own fate." To give continuity to his inquiries he has interpolated several brief chapters which give the historical background. There is a reassuring solidity about his vignettes, abundant evidence that he has read widely and made his way patiently through conflicting interpretations to his own conclusions. Old wine in new bottles, perhaps; but old wine that was safely locked in the musty cellars of still mustier specialists. Mr. Whitham's volume repeals the prohibition law and allows the profane reader to drink of the choicer and older vintages. It is a thoughtful book and an informative one, enriched by the author's sympathy and humanity. It deserves many readers, for Mr. Whitham writes vividly and entertainingly. At times he overreaches himself in a curious, apocalyptic style that makes one reader yearn for Strachey's tempered urbanity. But the flamboyant patches, luckily, are rare. American readers, nurtured on Carlyle and Mrs. Nesta Webster, would do well to turn to this volume for a truer appreciation of men and events in the French Revolution.

LEO GERSHOY

The Black Man's Burden

Caliban in Africa. By Leonard Barnes. J. B. Lippincott Company. $3.

IT'S only about 50,000 words. The subtitle is "An Impression of Color Madness." It deals with the sadism and social degeneration of race hatred. The victim is the African. The patient is the Afrikander, the white South African of remote and culturally almost severed Dutch ancestry, together with the Britisher who is assimilated to his color craze. If we are to believe the author, such Britishers are few and queer.

Just a word about the author's credibility. His diagnosis and indictment are moved by the same admirable social passion which illumined the works of E. D. Morel and Roger Casement. The only flaw is that Mr. Barnes is so excruciatingly British. He is a congenital proconsul of empire. He is British first and decent afterwards. He would have you know that if Caliban were not predominantly Boer but Anglo-Saxon, he wouldn't be Caliban but Caesar. Hence, for all his choice intelligence Mr. Barnes puts down black on white: "The *Pax Britannica* is the most powerful influence for social good since the *Pax Romana,*" especially for the *colored* races, "who look to the British crown, and the British crown alone, for sympathy, support, and leading in their struggle toward self-development." Yet Mr. Barnes's Anglophilia makes not the slightest difference here, for his charge is incontrovertible. He crosses himself whenever the ikon of the British "crown" flashes into his imperially religious mind—but he tells the truth about South Africa.

And he knows how to tell it. For one thing, he writes with a concentrated perspicacity which might have been easily bloated into several volumes. But he has chosen to compress it all into an essay of distilled criticism, into a pamphlet. "Caliban in Africa" is a pamphlet in the great tradition. It is explicitly a charge, but implicitly a monograph as well. Mr.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Barnes has not failed to draft the necessary scholarship for his propaganda with which to paralyze any possible vindication by those whom he attacks. He has the pamphleteer's ultimate skill of isolating his victim from any appeal to human conscience. And yet he does not leave him to the tender mercies of our unctuous hates. He lifts white South Africa to that abiding sense of pity in each of us which makes us wonder with a touch of morbid tragedy at beasts in human shape. The Boer, we feel, belongs to those eternal children of the race who "know not what they do."

Then, Mr. Barnes, who is a trained journalist, has a style peculiarly fit for publicism. It is farthest away from excited prattle or empty indignation. It is ironic but not cynical. It is effectively but impersonally malicious. It is simple for the ordinary, yet sophisticated for the more expert reader. It combines swift and sure, as against hasty, timeliness, closely fitting the social politics it handles, with an aura of dealing with the verities of human folly. Under Barnes the Afrikander really changes into Caliban. The poor race-crazed lout is dignified into the perennial brutality of man to man. He emerges as a sort of degraded and looney version of an Old Testament figure. Indeed, writes Mr. Barnes, the Old Testament, those inspired prolegomena of racial megalomania, is the Afrikander's primer.

But style alone is not enough. Mr. Barnes's main strength as a critical journalist is his method. It is a blend of three procedures. First, and throughout the book, there is running psychological analysis of South African interracial mentality. He describes this psychic degradation from various angles, as it affects both whites and blacks and their social crazy-quilt. The madness consists mainly in the Afrikander's almost total social preoccupation with racial hate and fear to the gradual evanescence of his other significant social problems, so that the national spirit, the culture itself, becomes a sort of glorified psychosis. Secondly, Mr. Barnes carries his psychological description of this South African sociality to its logical, or rather sociological, conclusions. He argues and points its inevitable consequences. He shifts the monograph into a pamphlet by showing just how these racial obsessions work socially, in terms of legislation, in policy, in persecution, in injustice, in the social illogicalness and immorality which kill the higher and fertilize the lowest social faculties. And, thirdly, he proves both his psychological description and his sociological indictment of Caliban by an extraordinarily judicious and strategic mastery of facts. His facts are comparatively few and far between. But they are so shrewdly tactical, they guide his view so perfectly, partly because they are taken from the mouths and statutes of Afrikander statesmen, because they are made and admitted by the dominant forces of Boer society, but mainly because each fact calls for no further context. It is like reading the main facts about Jack the Ripper. We may wish to know a great deal more about him to understand him better, but not in order to see his side. And so we may wish to know a great deal more about the South African race problem, but we can never think differently of the Boer unless his social outlook miraculously changes. And the miracle, Mr. Barnes assures us, cannot happen.

Mr. Barnes quotes some well-known Afrikander statesmen on the race problem. "No ethical consideration, such as the rights of man, will be allowed to stand in the way" of dealing with the black man, says one. "The dominant thing," says another, "has not been justice at all. . . . If we want to hold our own, we must exterminate the native." The great "liberal," General Smuts, is, if anything, more offensive for his unpleasant unctuousness. The social legislation against the Negro is really a legalized ramification of the third degree. And the social atmosphere is one of chronic *Schrecklichkeit*, a terror of conventions. Besides, the whole social structure be-

IDEAL MARRIAGE

ITS PHYSIOLOGY AND TECHNIQUE

by

Th. H. Van de Velde, M. D.

352 pages · $7.50

Formerly Director of the Gynecological Clinic of Haarlem. Translated by Stella Browne. Introduction by J. Johnston Abraham. With Eight Plates in Colors.

A sober, scientific, and complete book on the sexual relationship, in which will be found all the data bearing upon its physiology and technique. Written by one of the foremost gynecologists in the world, it should be in the library of every well-informed educator and social worker.

LIST OF CONTENTS

PART I

Introduction and General Physiology of Sex

CHAPTER I—*Marriage, Actual and Ideal*

CHAPTERS II and III—*The General Human Physiology of Sex.* The Evolution of the Sexual Impulse. Sexual Sensations and Internal Stimuli—Sexual Sensations and External Stimuli.

PART II

Specific Anatomy and Physiology of Sex

CHAPTERS IV, V, and VI — *The Sexual Physiology of the Adult Woman.* Introduction and Definition. The External Genital Organs. The Internal Genital Organs.

Ovarian Activity, Rhythm of Vital Manifestations in the Female Organism, and Menstruation.

CHAPTER VII—*Anatomy and Physiology of the Male Sexual Organs*

PART III

Sexual Intercourse Its Physiology and Technique

CHAPTER VIII — *Definitions, Prelude, and Love-Play.*

CHAPTERS IX, X, and XI — *Sexual Union (Communion).* Physiology and Technique. Position and Action During Coitus.

CHAPTER XII — *Further Manifestations During Coitus: Epilogue or After-Glow.*

PART IV

Hygiene of Ideal Marriage

CHAPTERS XIII, XIV, XV, and XVI —*Bodily Hygiene.* First Intercourse or Defloration—Honeymoon

Influence of the Sexual Function on Physique and Psyche—Sexual Vigour or Potency.

Personal and External Factors Affecting Sexual Intercourse.

Sexual Intercourse in Special Bodily (or physical) Circumstances. Sexual Intercourse during Menstruation.

Care and Cleanliness of the Organs of Copulation.

CHAPTER XVII—*Psychic, Emotional and Mental Hygiene.*

The sale of this book, because of its scientific character, is positively restricted to physicians, social workers, lawyers, ministers, and educators. Please state qualifications in ordering.

COVICI-FRIEDE, *Publishers*
386 Fourth Avenue, New York City

PLEASE enter my order for_____cop_____of IDEAL MARRIAGE by Th. H. Van de Velde, at $7.50 the copy. ☐ I enclose check. ☐ Send C.O.D.

Name_____

Address_____

Qualification_____ (N2)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comes increasingly irrational, and makes no sense in its growing hopelessness. The native, whose person and society are peculiarly bound up with the land, is being constantly legislated and wedged into smaller, less productive, wilder reservations, into a variety of wilderness stockades. He has no right to purchase land. "He is the victim of a common swindle," of statutory dispossession for white privilege. Even on the reservations the social patterns of the Negro are constantly torn up. Hundreds of thousands of black men are squeezed out from the land entirely. And so the Afrikander is beginning to legislate against their presence in industrial centers. Thus an ever-larger number of blacks are literally illegal entities, for they have no place to go in their own country. In fact, the legal color bar in South Africa, as the color bar everywhere else, is the juridical absurdity of making life itself a contraband. The Afrikander is much perturbed by the industrial ignorance of the Negro, yet he legally enforces this ignorance by limiting black educational opportunities to practically nothing. The whole system is based on securing the total insecurity of the native in order to exploit him. And the result is that the South African Negro is not merely a proletarian, but what the Germans call a *Lumpenproletarier,* not merely abysmally poor but degradedly so, a pauper without rights, disinherited and terrorized. Social politics in South Africa is the politics of fear. It is crazy. "The Afrikander," says Mr. Barnes, "is, in simple truth, a . . . monomaniac."

The Boer can do no wrong. The native has no rights. And there is no hope. There must be an explosion. "Even if a changed intention suddenly flashed into the Afrikander mind, it could not . . . . avert collision. South Africa must now proceed straight to disaster by mere force of inertia." Her sinister and tragic lesson to Jim Crow America should be rather obvious.

BENJAMIN STOLBERG

Books in Brief

Noguchi. By Gustav Eckstein. Harper and Brothers. $5.

The poverty of his home, the example of his mother, a heroic peasant woman who lived with dignity and without help the common, inexorable epic of a hard life, and an accident with fire that left him with a deformed hand and the cripple's necessity to win a compensating distinction—these were the factors that developed the native endurance, intelligence, and energies of Yone Noguchi to greatness. His career is a stirring one, a remarkable record of achievement from the days when he paid for medical care with nurse-boy services, through his work in syphilis, paresis, spotted fever, and other germ diseases, to his death in Africa, a martyr in the fight against yellow fever. Like many great scientists he was the artist type; he made up for long spells of inattention and neglect with titanic orgies of activity, and when in the midst of his work was often able to go without sleep for weeks. He was daring, imaginative, and devoted. To this account of his life his biographer has brought a scientist's comprehension of his work, a good writer's innate psychological understanding, and a spirited style.

Green Hell. By Julian Duguid. The Century Company. $4.

The book is as melodramatic as its title. It is the record of adventures in the South American jungle that is no respecter of frontiers and covers large parts of Bolivia, Argentina, Paraguay, and Brazil. Though the adventures are exciting enough, the author does his best to intensify them with literary devices, spreading over "Green Hell" an added coat of livid green rhetoric. The paint, however, to the reader sensitive to uses of rhetoric, is not of a high grade, and is applied with a house-painter's technique.

Valencia. By Leon Tahcheechee. Coward-McCann. $2.50.

Leon Tahcheechee's first novel is a tale of odd characters and the odd happenings that shaped the devious patterns of their lives. The setting is that of the Spanish city of Valencia. The characters, except for the protagonist, who is an American, are Spaniards and gipsies. The episodes are picaresque: fortune-telling with the Tarot pack, business ventures that never emerge from the dream stage, diverse love affairs, a fantastic duel, an even more fantastic trial for parricide, and adventures that culminate in the "learnedly obscene pantomime" of the gipsy marriage dance, which is wasted upon a reluctant and over-fastidious American. Mr. Tahcheechee handles his material well. He knows how to set his palette for southern Spain, and he does not load his brush too heavily. His gipsies and his amiably grotesque aristocrats have the color and air of authenticity. The fact that he is a painter as well as a writer makes him a keen observer of the visible world and gives his descriptions an unusual sensitiveness and exactness. Mr. Tahcheechee has distinct narrative gifts, a prose manner which is unmistakably his own, and a deft way of modeling characters. His creation of the character of El Conde de Jenor is an achievement; indeed, it is the real achievement of the book, and one which puts "Valencia" high among the first novels of the season.

The Weigher of Souls. By André Maurois. Translated by Hamish Miles. D. Appleton and Company. $2.

The efforts of a doctor to capture the immortal energies given off at death form the thin body of this story by the well-known French biographer and novelist. Curiously enough, the events have a strange warmth, and the defeats and successes of the doctor's efforts, with their final pathetic denouement, are, if not exactly exciting, at least never dull. Though the conception is fantastic, the author has managed to make it glow with the light of possibility and the warmth of human emotions.

Zuñi Folk Tales. By Franklin Hamilton Cushing. Alfred A. Knopf. $5.

"Zuñi Folk Tales" has long been an appreciated book, much sought and hard to secure, with libraries and individuals everywhere on the lookout for a copy. The eagerness of the quest is fair indication of the merit of the work, for Cushing is one of three or four writers sufficiently endowed to give us translations of American Indian tales that are true to their native quality and in our own tongue are literature. Actually the tales are something more than folk-tales in any ordinary sense; they are reflections of the complexion of mind of one of the most interesting people in the world, giving such pictures of the *mores* of a folk as the reasoned investigations of the sociologist might never discover, and—because Cushing was a genius—going beyond the sociological into the philosophical and aesthetic understanding of that nature which expresses itself in *mores* and creates the folk. In this respect Cushing's work is a contribution to far more than any mere interest of curiosity or pastime; it is a lasting part of our American heritage, definitively among our "classics." These facts make obvious the value of a new and beautifully printed edition of the "Zuñi Folk Tales," including Major Powell's Foreword, and with an added introduction by Mary Austin.

There Will Be Fighting. By Peadar O'Donnell. G. P. Putnam's Sons. $2.50.

Here is a swiftly moving story of insurrections and intrigues among Irish patriots and renegades in 1921, involving characters whose humanness and aliveness, even whose quaintness, are admirable and enjoyable. It is unfortunate that the jacket gives away the outcome of this exciting, though formalized, adventure story.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Nationalism in the Philippines

By ANDRES V. CASTILLO

IMMEDIATELY after his return from his trip to the United States in the interest of Philippine independence, Manuel Roxas, Speaker of the Philippine legislature, announced plans for a new nationalistic movement. The central idea of this movement, popularly known as Ang Bagong Katipunan, is, as the Speaker puts it, "to take the course that we should take were we independent." The aims of the Bagong Katipunan as embodied in its decalogue are the inculcation of a belief in national destiny; the attainment of national unity, economic nationalism, racial equality; the husbanding of human resources; veneration for the past; the fostering of national culture, national discipline, honest government, and idealism. In short, it is an attempt to work out thoroughly and peacefully the whole Philippine problem.

The Bagong Katipunan does not advocate violence to carry out its aims. It is not revolutionary or "boxer" in character. It is entirely free from the taint of communism. It has no party affiliations, nor has it any political purposes to serve. It is non-sectarian and is national in scope.

The organization has caught the popular imagination, and people from all walks of life and of all political and religious beliefs are rallying to its support. Membership is open to all Filipino citizens. It requires from every member a yearly fee of one peso (fifty cents), and, what is far more important, it expects all its members to practice the tenets of the organization in their daily life. There are junior chapters to reach the young people, especially students in the public schools, and chapters for women, who try to give effect to the humane side of the movement in the home. In the first week after the movement was formally launched on November 30 last, it received more than 20,000 pesos as fees besides donations of all sorts, and it even has the sympathy and cooperation of the foreign community. A number of American residents signified their intention of becoming members, but their applications were respectfully rejected because only Filipinos could be admitted. The organization has found support not only in the city of Manila and other centers; the provinces too have registered their unqualified cooperation, and the provincial governors have been organizing chapters in their respective districts.

Perhaps the greatest inspiration to the launching of the Bagong Katipunan was the conception, widely prevalent among Americans, that the Filipinos do not really want independence, and that they have not demonstrated by deeds their willingness to shoulder the responsibilities of a truly independent existence. This accusation the Bagong Katipunan attempts to challenge vigorously. The Filipino nationalist leaders have finally come to the conclusion that the struggle for independence must be fought and won or lost in the Philippines. They propose to fight and win it by means of economic nationalism. Article III of the decalogue of the Bagong Katipunan states:

> We believe that our country is the inalienable patrimony of our people. We shall conserve and develop our lands, mines, water power, and other resources, and shall insist that their control be forever kept in the hands of our people. We shall practice economic nationalism. We shall produce and organize for economic self-sufficiency. We shall produce what we need and buy what we produce. We shall encourage the restoration of our former household industries. We shall patronize our countrymen who are engaged in business but condemn those who exploit their customers. We shall buy from abroad only those commodities which we cannot produce.

The doctrine of absolute non-intercourse with other nations is not advocated, as the careless observer might conclude. In international trade, of course, one has to buy in order to sell. None of the economic doctrines advocated by the Bagong Katipunan come into conflict with this economic truism; most of them aim to realize it more fully. By the encouragement of home industries more people will find employment and their purchasing power will be increased. Consequently production will be accelerated to meet the increased demand for commodities, and the cost of production of goods for native consumption as well as for export will be lowered by the economy of large-scale production. The nations which demand Philippine products will thus benefit by the lower price, while the Filipinos will demand more goods of the luxury type mainly supplied from abroad, thus enabling foreign nations to trade more extensively with them.

A cursory review of the economic history of the Philippines during both the Spanish and American administrations recalls the efforts of the Filipinos to bring into fruition the rich natural resources of the islands. The more benevolent and farsighted of the Spanish governors encouraged the development of native industries, which decayed or were neglected under less competent and more grasping men. The Bagong Katipunan attempts to resuscitate these forgotten and neglected industries, which were once the mainstay of the islands and one of the most important reasons for the reluctance of Spain to surrender them. It has been pointed out that the domestic system of home industries conducted without elaborate machinery cannot survive the competition of the outside world, but the supporters of the movement assert, with strong backing of facts, that there are native industries that can be developed without the aid of machinery so as to sell their products at reasonably low prices.

Under American administration the Philippines fare no better than they did under Spanish, in spite of the supposed advantages conferred by the free-trade relations between the two countries, first established in a limited way in 1909 and finally in 1913. The benefits of free trade cannot be denied but they have been exaggerated. Free trade has brought the Philippines into a state of economic dependence upon the United States. It has given birth to industries, the most notable example being the sugar industry, which depend for their existence upon the continuance of this paternalistic arrangement. These artificially nourished industries, enjoying a special market, can last only as long as their special privi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PANACEAS

ALMOST every one you meet has a different explanation for the depression, a different remedy. The panacea market is glutted. Yet you feel there is still room for the truth, for the plan that will really get results. That, at least, was how we felt before talking with George H. Hull. Afterwards, the more we thought about it the more strongly we felt that his explanation and his plan were the truth, or as near it as a mere human can be expected to come.

Others have spoken vaguely of psychology, boom and depression, of the neglect of economic laws, of the need for organization and planning for the future. Mr. Hull speaks plainly of one specific origin of depressions, of the need for a specific organization in one specific key industry, of a specific new form of profit distribution—simple and possible of achievement—which would solve the problem of consumption, which is no more than the problem of buying power at this time, and which would pool the interests of Capital and Labor. His plan is something to get your teeth into, something that every one should have the chance to think about—and act upon. He calls it *Collective Capitalism,* and it appears in the July

NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

You may read this, the first part of Henry Carter's estimate of Governor Ritchie's qualifications for the Presidency, Julius M. Nolte's diagnosis of the ills of real estate, Louise Maunsell Field's *Cynics Leave the Theatre,* Frank E. Gaebelein's *An Evangelical's Defense,* and many other significant and interesting articles, as well as an unusual short story by John Lineaweaver—by taking advantage of this special offer open to new members until July 20th: a six months' subscription for One Dollar.

THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW
9 EAST 37TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY

For the enclosed One Dollar send me THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW for 6 months (Canadian Price, $1.25; Foreign, $1.50).

Name .....

Address .....

City ..... *State* .....

NATION—JULY

leges continue. The present tariff arrangement is only a temporary makeshift. As a matter of fact, the past few years have witnessed numerous attempts in Congress to undo it, the success of which would also mean the undoing of the industries favored by the present free-trade relations. Many bills in one form or another have been introduced into Congress seeking to limit duty-free Philippine sugar to 500,000 tons a year. The dairy industry of America has conducted on numerous occasions a vigorous campaign against the entrance of copra and cocoanut oil into the American market free of duty. As a practical answer to these threats, the Bagong Katipunan tries to discourage industries dependent on free trade with the United States, and takes the initiative in establishing and strengthening industries that can compete in the world market. With the present tariff arrangement the Philippines are entirely powerless to develop their economic life to meet world competition. Even against the competition of foreign goods other than American, it is extremely difficult for the islands to gain protection. The Bagong Katipunan seeks to protect the native producer and merchant not by means of a tariff, but by a nation-wide campaign to induce the people to patronize them instead of the foreigner. America is ready to teach the Filipinos all the doctrines of economics except that of protection, of which she is the most ardent exponent in the world.

The consequences of this social-economic-political movement should be far-reaching. It enjoys and will continue to enjoy public favor and following because it appeals not only to the inherent love of liberty in mankind, but also to the natural desire for a more prosperous and wholesome life. The new nationalistic movement serves notice that a peaceful and orderly economic revolution which seeks to avoid the mistakes of older and more advanced countries has already begun in the Philippines.

Contributors to This Issue

ALANSON B. HOUGHTON, former ambassador to Germany and to Great Britain, has a knowledge of the present European situation equaled by few Americans.

JOHN B. WHITTON is associate professor of international law at Princeton University.

BERTRAND RUSSELL, the distinguished British mathematician and philosopher, has in recent years been carrying on an interesting experiment in the field of progressive education.

HENRY R. LINVILLE is the president of the Teachers Union of the City of New York.

LESLIE NELSON JENNINGS contributes verse to various periodicals.

PAUL BLANSHARD is the executive director of the City Affairs Committee of New York.

WILLIAM E. DUNKMAN is on the staff of the Business School at Columbia University.

LEO GERSHOY is assistant professor of history at Long Island University.

BENJAMIN STOLBERG is a writer on economic and other subjects for current periodicals.

ANDRES V. CASTILLO, having spent four years at Columbia University, has now returned to his home in the Philippines.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED